

LEADERSHIP TEAM'S INFLUENCE ON TEACHER SELF-  
ACTUALIZATION AND PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

AN ABSTRACT

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

NELLIE RUTH WRIGHT ADAMS

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA  
JULY, 1982

R v T 130

## ABSTRACT

### Statement of the Problem

The problem involved in this study was to determine whether or not the perceptions of the leadership role as held and participated in by the leadership team members and the teachers in their respective school units serve to induce increased pupil achievement in mathematics and reading and a fuller measure of teacher self-actualization in selected Atlanta Public Schools.

### Specific Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the duties and tasks of the leadership team, as measured by the agreement/disagreement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

Instructional Coordination  
Curriculum Development  
Staff Development  
Evaluation  
General School Improvement  
Personnel  
Rules and Discipline  
General Administration  
Policy making

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the performance of duties and tasks by the leadership team, as measured by the



engagement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

Instructional Coordination  
Curriculum Development  
Staff Development  
Evaluation  
General School Improvement  
Personnel  
Rules and Discipline  
General Administration  
Policymaking

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the degree of self-actualization of leadership team members and non-leadership team members, as determined by the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

#### Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this research was to determine the extent to which the leadership role as perceived by and participated (shared) in by members of leadership teams and classroom teachers in their respective school units fosters increased pupil achievement (performance on standardized tests) in mathematics and reading, and stimulates the development (realization) of teacher self-actualization in Area II Public Schools in Atlanta, Georgia.

#### The Population and Sample

The research sample for this study was drawn from ten high achieving and ten low achieving schools in Area II of the Atlanta Public Schools, as revealed by the 1980-81 results of the California Achievement Tests. The subjects

included twenty (20) principals, twenty (20) leadership team chairpersons, and forty (40) randomly selected non-leadership team members who responded to the Leadership Team Questionnaire. Those responding to the Personal Orientation Inventory included the forty (40) non-leadership team members who constituted the same group responding to the Leadership Team Questionnaire, and forty (40) randomly selected leadership team members.

### Findings

The findings of this study are as follows:

1. There are significant differences in the response of principals and leadership team chairpersons to agreement/disagreement items in the category of General School Improvement on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 9).
2. There are significant differences in the response of principals and non-leadership team members to agreement/disagreement items in the categories of Curriculum Development and Policymaking on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 10).
3. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to agreement/disagreement items in a majority (six) of the nine categories (Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, General Administration, and Policymaking) on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table II).
4. There are significant differences in the response of principals in high and low achieving schools to agreement/disagreement items in the category of Instructional Coordination on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 12).
5. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to engagement items in the category of General Administration on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 15).

6. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team members in high and low achieving schools to items on the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Table 17).
7. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team members and non-leadership team members to items on the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Tables 19-20).

### Conclusions

The findings of this study warrant the following conclusions:

1. There is lack of unanimity by principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members on the role expectations (duties and tasks) of the leadership team.
2. Leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members tend to differ more widely than other groups in this study in their perceptions of the duties and tasks of the leadership team.
3. Principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members are in general agreement in their perceptions of the performance of duties and tasks of the leadership team.
4. Principals and teachers (leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members) are more in agreement on the duties and tasks of the leadership team than teachers (leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members) are among themselves.
5. There is insufficient evidence to substantiate that leadership practices and functions had an impact on pupil achievement in this study.
6. Leadership team members in this study experienced a greater measure of self-actualization.

### Implications

Certain implications that grew out of the findings are:

1. The leadership team model offers a potentially useful approach for fostering teacher self-actualization and pupil achievement.
2. Mutual agreement and understanding of duties and functions may maximize participation, as well as pupil achievement and teacher self-actualization.
3. The principal's perception of the duties and functions of the leadership team may be a meaningful factor in team performance and pupil achievement.

### Recommendations

The recommendations resulting from this study are:

1. That a study structured around the variables or factors of involvement and time compensation be conducted on the leadership team to ascertain possible suggestions for increasing the team's effectiveness in regard to maximizing pupil achievement.
2. That studies be done on the role of the leadership team as perceived by principals in order to test the hypothesis that "Authority vested in a given role is maximized by congruence of role expectations and role performance."
3. That sensitivity training and human relations workshops be held for principals, leadership team members, and non-leadership team members for the purpose of promoting mutual trust, confidence and cooperation.
4. That in-service programs be conducted for instructional personnel to become more knowledgeable about the basic concept of shared leadership and the benefits of team participation in school decision making.

LEADERSHIP TEAM'S INFLUENCE ON TEACHER SELF-  
ACTUALIZATION AND PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY  
NELLIE RUTH WRIGHT ADAMS

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA  
JULY, 1982

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Rationale . . . . .	1
Evolution of the Problem . . . . .	6
Contribution to Educational Knowledge . . . . .	8
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	9
Specific Hypotheses . . . . .	9
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	10
Basic Assumptions . . . . .	11
Scope and Limitations of the Study . . . . .	12
Definition of Terms . . . . .	12
Locale of the Study . . . . .	14
Time Period of the Study . . . . .	14
Description of Subjects . . . . .	15
Description of Materials/Instruments . . . . .	15
Method of Research . . . . .	15
Research Procedure . . . . .	16
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	19
Theoretical Framework . . . . .	19
Team Leadership . . . . .	25
Shared Decision Making . . . . .	30
Self-Actualization . . . . .	36
Pupil Achievement . . . . .	41
Summary . . . . .	45
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES . . . . .	47
The Population Sample . . . . .	47
The Instruments . . . . .	50
The Leadership Team Questionnaire . . . . .	50
The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) . . . . .	51
Treatment of the Data . . . . .	54
Specific Hypotheses . . . . .	56
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS . . . . .	58
Presentation and Item Analysis of Data Result- ing from the Leadership Team Questionnaire	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

in Significant Categories . . . . .	.58
Instructional Coordination . . . . .	.59
Curriculum Development . . . . .	.63
Staff Development . . . . .	.69
Evaluation . . . . .	.75
General School Improvement . . . . .	.78
General Administration . . . . .	.82
Policymaking . . . . .	.91
Presentation and Analysis of Data of Means and "t" Values Resulting from the Leadership Team Questionnaire . . . . .	.94
Presentation and Analysis of Data Resulting from the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) . . .	106
V.. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	112
Summary of Findings . . . . .	114
Discussion . . . . .	115
Conclusions . . . . .	123
Implications . . . . .	124
Recommendations . . . . .	124
APPENDIX . . . . .	125
A. Correspondence . . . . .	126
B. Instruments . . . . .	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	131
VITA . . . . .	136

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Principals in High and Low Achieving Schools to Agreement/Disagreement Items in the Category of Instructional Coordination on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	60
2.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Principals, Leadership Team Chairpersons and Non-Leadership Team Members to Agreement/Disagreement Items in the Category of Curriculum Development on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	64
3.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Leadership Team Chairpersons and Non-Leadership Team Members to Agreement/Disagreement Items in the Category of Staff Development on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	70
4.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Leadership Team Chairpersons and Non-Leadership Team Members to Agreement/Disagreement Items in the Category of Evaluation on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	76
5.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Principals, Leadership Team Chairpersons and Non-Leadership Team Members to Agreement/Disagreement Items in the Category of General School Improvement on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	79
6.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Leadership Team Chairpersons and Non-Leadership Team Members to Agreement/Disagreement Items in the Category of General Administration on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	83
7.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Leadership Team Chairpersons and Non-Leadership Team Members to Engagement Items in the Category of General Administration on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	87
8.	Item Response of the Perceptions of Leadership Team Chairpersons and Non-Leadership Team Members to Agreement/Disagreement Items in the Category of Policymaking on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	92
9.	Means and "t" Values of Scores on the Items of Agreement/Disagreement on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> for Principals vs. Leadership Team Chairpersons . . . . .	95
10.	Means and "t" Values of Scores on the Items of Agreement/Disagreement on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> for Principals vs. Non-Leadership Team Members . . . . .	96



## LIST OF TABLES--Continued

11.	Means and "t" Values of Scores on the Items of Agreement/Disagreement on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> for Leadership Team Chairpersons vs. Non-Leadership Team Members . . . . .	98
12.	Means and "t" Values for Principals, Leadership Team Chairpersons, and Non-Leadership Team Members on the Agreement/Disagreement Items of the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	100
13.	Means and "t" Values of Scores on the Items of Engagement on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> for Principles vs. Leadership Team Chairpersons . . . . .	101
14.	Means and "t" Values of Scores on the Items of Engagement on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> for Principals vs. Non-Leadership Team Members . . . . .	102
15.	Means and "t" Values of Scores on the Items of Engagement on the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> for Leadership Team Chairpersons vs. Non-Leadership Team Members . . . . .	103
16.	Means and "t" Values for Principals, Leadership Team Chairpersons, and Non-Leadership Team Members on the Engagement Items of the <u>Leadership Team Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	105
17.	Means and "t" Values for Leadership Team Members in High and Low Achieving Schools with Respect to the Time Competence and Inner Directed Scales of the <u>Personal Orientation Inventory</u> . . . . .	106
18.	Means and "t" Values for High and Low Achieving Non-Leadership Team Members on Time Competence and Inner Directed Scales of the <u>Personal Orientation Inventory</u> . . . . .	107
19.	Analysis of Variance for Degree of Self-Actualization for Leadership Team Members and Non-Leadership Team Members by the Time Competence Scale of the <u>Personal Orientation Inventory</u> in High and Low Achieving Schools . . . . .	108
20.	Analysis of Variance for Degree of Self-Actualization for Leadership Team Members and Non-Leadership Team Members by the Inner Directed Scale of the <u>Personal Orientation Inventory</u> in High and Low Achieving Schools . . . . .	109

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer's thanks and appreciation are extended to all who contributed to the successful completion of this study. So many people helped in so many ways that it is impossible to mention them all.

The writer feels deeply indebted to her Committee, which consisted of Dr. Robert Hatch, chairperson, Dr. Stephen Herrmann, Dr. Anna Pearl Atkinson, and Dr. William (Bill) Hammond. Their individual and collective expertise was invaluable throughout the study.

Commendations and expressions of gratitude are also extended to some special people -- Mr. Larry Watts for processing the data; Mr. Reisar Williams, Ms. Emma Lois Jackson, and Mrs. Jeanette Brown for typing of rough drafts; and Mrs. Carol Wheeler for the typing of the finished product.

To her husband, Jacob B. Adams, M.D., and her son, Anthony B. Adams, M.D., as well as her mother, Mrs. Lessie Lee Wright, and brother, James E. Wright, Jr., this dissertation is lovingly and appreciatively dedicated. Without their continued patience and support, this task would have been impossible.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Rationale

In recent years, schools have greatly broadened their opportunity for teacher participation in the decision making about and direction of school programs by organizing administrative, supervisory, instruction, and staff personnel around the concept of "team leadership" or "team management". This "team" concept of pooled expertise, intelligence, resources, and concerns of the educational personnel holds the possibility and potential of bringing about improvement in the quality of education for boys and girls, and a degree of satisfaction for the teachers themselves.

Demands by the public for relevancy, accountability, performance results, and priorities identification, in the face of pupils' declining reading and mathematics achievement, call for the discovery and development of effective and efficient leadership of all kinds responsible and accountable for the management tasks in the teaching-learning situation. Thus, on the educational scene in recent years, a movement with respect to changing the curriculum, influencing teaching procedures and motivation, and upgrading pupil achievement at the local school site has

been the formation of leadership teams, school-site councils, planning bodies, or some form of a decision-making board. In the context of this study, such decision-making groups shall be referred to as leadership teams.

With the opportunity to make school decisions, the leadership team has a unique role of motivating and enabling teachers to bring about a positive (and meaningful) change in pupil achievement on the one hand and stimulating the attainment of teacher self-actualization on the other. Teachers need sound practices, instructional skills, and perceptions which stimulate pupils' growth and achievement. Moreover, teachers must know how to plan for and function in terms of expected or planned-for performance results. In other words, teachers need ways and means of making themselves, students, and the instructional program more efficient and more effective. To meet these needs the leadership team brings together the principal, the librarian or media specialist, a resource staff member, selected classroom teachers, a parent or layman from the community and in some instances, a representative of the student body, for the purpose of providing instructional leadership, making decisions, and planning strategies for the school's instructional program.<sup>1</sup>

The focus of the leadership team's decision making is

---

<sup>1</sup>Atlanta Public Schools, Elementary Curriculum Development, "Management by Objectives Procedures Plan," 1977, p. 2 (mimeographed).

on pupil performance and achievement. Involvement in team efforts and the sharing of leadership responsibilities are believed to facilitate teacher self-actualization. The basic philosophy which undergirds the involvement of leadership teams is the assumption that the manifold of team efforts will ultimately impact teaching (teachers) and learning (pupils).

This study, therefore, explores the possible impacts of the leadership team's duties, responsibilities, and activities in decision making and the impact of teacher self-actualization on pupil achievement.

The team approach makes it imperative to relegate to the leadership team school decisions traditionally handled by the principal. Nine areas of school decisions have been identified in a recent study: (1) instructional coordination, (2) curriculum development, (3) staff development, (4) evaluation, (5) general school improvement, (6) personnel, (7) rules and discipline, (8) general administration, and (9) policy-making.<sup>2</sup> Although examples of teacher involvement may be found in each of these areas, the concept of the team approach must be emphasized.

Present-day practices with the leadership-team approach to curriculum and instruction tend to decentralize

---

<sup>2</sup>Daniel L. Duke, Beverly K. Showers, and Michael Imber, "Teachers and Shared Decision Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement," Educational Administration Quarterly, (Winter, 1980), p. 93.

decision making, which may well modify the principal's role in this regard. As pointed out by Pellicer and Nemeth,<sup>3</sup> "principals can no longer be expected to know all the answers, make all the decisions, and be everywhere at the same time."

In a sense the leadership team may free the principal to devote more time and energy to top-level leadership for curriculum development and the organization and evaluation of instruction. In the experience of this writer, a higher quality of learning is fostered through the differentiated staff resources made available to students through leadership team arrangements.

The concept of team leadership and management can be traced to several management principles. Underlying assumptions of McGregor's Theory Y suggest the formation of an administrative team. McGregor states that "Management leans on a weak crutch if it relies too much on authority today."<sup>4</sup>

The Scanlon Plan, developed by Joseph Scanlon, embodies the ideas of participation and shared decision making. The plan advocates cooperative, participatory effort in

---

<sup>3</sup>Leonard O. Pellicer and Gyuri Nemeth, "Tired of Carrying the World on Your Shoulders? Try Team Management," The National Association of Secondary School Principals, (November, 1980), p. 98.

<sup>4</sup>Douglas Murray McGregor, "The Human Side of Enterprise," Classics of Organizational Behavior, ed. Walter E. Natemeyer (Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company, Inc., 1978), p. 16.

order to "provide encouragement to people to direct their creative energies toward organizational objectives, give them some voice in decisions that affect them, provide significant opportunities for the satisfaction of social and egoistic needs"<sup>5</sup>.

The foregoing positions follow closely the theory advanced by Abraham Maslow on the hierarchy of needs. Maslow sets forth the idea that after man's physical needs are met, he begins to seek satisfaction of social, egoistic, and self-fulfillment needs. For "self-actualization," to use Maslow's terms, people want to feel appreciated, to be loved, and to be accepted in society. Moreover, people have a need to express their talents and be recognized for their accomplishments.<sup>6</sup>

In a study by Duke and others<sup>7</sup>, it was concluded that "benefits of shared decision making accrue, not from mere involvement, but rather from a combination of involvement and influence." The authors further suggest that provisions for actual influence over decisions be included in shared decision making.

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>6</sup>A.H. Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation", Classics of Organizational Behavior, ed. Walter E. Nattemeyer (Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company, Inc., 1978), pp. 48-51.

<sup>7</sup>Duke, Showers, and Imber, "Teachers and Shared Decision Making", p. 104.

The authority of the leadership team must be ensured, and the team must be able to demonstrate authority in such a way that it is accepted by the staff. Thus, the ability to perceive and satisfy the set of expectations associated with the duties and functions of the leadership team offers one a great challenge.

This rationale might well discuss how and/or why the leadership team also must portray the role of fostering and/or nurturing the self-actualization of teachers since the research problem implies the leadership team's impact on teacher self-actualization as well as pupil achievement.

This rationale, therefore, suggests the possibility of studying the functions and duties of the leadership team as perceived by principals, randomly selected non-team members, and team members themselves to find out more about the leadership team's influence on teacher self-actualization and the ultimate impact on pupil achievement.

#### Evolution of the Problem

Public schools in the city of Atlanta were introduced to the team concept of leadership in 1973 when each school participating in the Elementary Curriculum Development (ECD) project was advised to establish a leadership team within the school to implement, guide, and direct the new Curriculum Development project.

In the meantime, reports of pupils' standardized test results continued to show pupils in the Atlanta Public



School System scoring far below the national norms in reading and mathematics. In an effort to overcome the problem of pupils' poor test performance, the school system embarked upon a five-year plan to accelerate the rate of gain in pupil achievement or test performance in reading and mathematics, beginning with the 1980-81 school term. The goal, a twenty percent increase in grade-level performance towards the norm each year, is to be attained by each school in the system as a part of the determination to reach the national norm in five years. Leadership in the individual schools for the upgrading of pupil achievement on standardized tests is to be provided by the school's leadership team.

After one year into the five-year-plan of improvement pupils' achievement on standardized tests revealed gains far beyond the expected twenty percent. As a result of this astounding surge in pupils' test performance, this writer became interested in examining the functions and practices of leadership teams to determine their impact on pupil achievement and factors relating to teacher self-actualization. Out of this writer's continuous pursuit for effective leadership procedures and practices, as well as her genuine concern for the improvement of pupil performance and achievement evolved this proposed research problem titled "Leadership Team's Influence on Teacher Self-Actualization and Pupil Achievement."

### Contribution to Educational Knowledge

The growing complexity of the roles and relationships among administrative, supervisory, instructional and support personnel at the school-site level and the need for rapid assimilation of research findings to assist those in decision-making positions and situations strongly suggest the need for continuous research dealing with efficient and effective management-administrative strategies and procedures to be used in local school sites. A growing body of research related to the "team" concept of leadership has enormous potential for energizing efficient and effective instructional strategies and stimulating harmonious and productive personnel relationships in school situations.

The results of this research might well serve to focus on the commonly held principle that the "image" of the school's leadership held by classroom teachers has a positive effect on the extent to which teachers can be stimulated to the more efficient and effective instructional strategies which, in turn, are conducive to increased scholastic performance of pupils.

There is also a need for systematic knowledge about what the leadership team does to influence pupils' achievement and how shared leadership affects the participants in that shared leadership. Such research can be useful to principals and other team members in improving their practices and procedures, and to the school system in providing productive inservice training. Increasing our understanding

of the team approach to leadership may not only improve our schools, but also add to our knowledge of administration and supervision in other areas.

Results stemming from this research might well indicate fruitful approaches to minimizing and/or eliminating the adversarial stance between administrative-supervisory personnel and the instructional personnel in the teaching-learning situation within any given school unit.

### Statement of the Problem

The problem involved in this study was to determine whether or not the perceptions of the leadership role as held and participated in by the leadership team members and the teachers in their respective school units serve to induce increased pupil achievement in mathematics and reading and a fuller measure of teacher self-actualization in selected Atlanta Public Schools.

### Specific Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the duties and tasks of the leadership team, as measured by the agreement/disagreement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

- Instructional Coordination
- Curriculum Development
- Staff Development
- Evaluation
- General School Improvement
- Personnel
- Rules and Discipline

General Administration  
Policymaking

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the performance of duties and tasks by the leadership team, as measured by the engagement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

Instructional Coordination  
Curriculum Development  
Staff Development  
Evaluation  
General School Improvement  
Personnel  
Rules and Discipline  
General Administration  
Policymaking

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the degree of self-actualization of leadership team members and non-leadership team members, as determined by the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this research was to determine the extent to which the leadership role as perceived by and participated (shared) in by members of leadership teams and the classroom teachers in their respective school units fosters increased pupil achievement (performance on standardized tests) in mathematics and reading, and stimulates the development (realization) of teacher self-actualization in Area II Public Schools in Atlanta, Georgia.

More specifically, the purposes of this research were to:

1. Identify the specific instructional leadership and decision making role patterns and performance, as perceived by:
  - a. the principals
  - b. the leadership team members
  - c. the randomly selected teachers who are non-team members
2. Determine the frequency with which:
  - a. the leadership team indicates it actualizes its perceptions of its role in school decision-making situations
  - b. the principals indicate their observation of the implementation of their perceptions of the leadership team's performance in decision making
  - c. the randomly selected non-leadership team members (teachers) indicate their observation of the implementation of their perceptions of the leadership team's performance in decision making
3. Determine the difference in the percent of frequency of indicated (reported) performance of the leadership (decision-making) role:
  - a. leadership team - principals
  - b. leadership team - non-leadership team members
  - c. principals - non-leadership team members
4. Determine the extent of the self-actualization which leadership team members derive from functioning in the role of leadership team members.
5. Formulate the statements of findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations derived from the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered in this study.

#### Basic Assumptions

1. Shared leadership in school decision making is desirable in the pursuit of the school's educational goals.

2. Decision making shared through a decentralized school-site organization, such as a leadership team, fosters pupil achievement and teacher self-actualization.
3. Pupil achievement and teacher self-actualization are maximized by the congruence of role expectations and role performance.
4. An assessment of shared leadership role expectations and role performance, as well as teacher self-actualization, can be made by the type of techniques (measurement and evaluation) employed in this study.
5. Shared leadership in school decision making is conducive to increased achievement and enhanced teacher self-actualization.

#### Scope and Limitations of the Study

1. The sample size of this research is limited to two-thirds (upper one-third and lower one-third) of the thirty-two Area II elementary schools with respect to gains in pupil achievement in reading and mathematics during the 1980-81 school term. Technically, this target population is comprised of all the principals and all the leadership teams of elementary schools in Area II Atlanta Public Schools, together with randomly selected teachers, who fall in the upper and lower thirds. Hence, there is the limitation of the percent indicator of any to be observed as less than 100 percent of the respondents.
2. A limitation inherent in this study is the extent to which the questionnaire respondents are:
  - a. Knowledgeable about the requested data called for on the questionnaire items.
  - b. Willing to respond truthfully to the questionnaire items.
3. The extent to which the instrumentation by the researcher is adequate to provide the answers sought in this study is also considered a limitation.

#### Definitions of Terms

The following terms are considered basic to the clarification of the study:

1. Area II Schools - One of the three school districts in the Atlanta Public School System, comprised of thirty-two elementary schools, twelve high schools, and one special school, covering a wide geographical area, and supervised by one single area superintendent.
2. Increased Pupil Achievement - The grade-point level achievement throughout a specific reporting period (a year), as indicated by standardized test results.

Specifically, for this study, "increase in pupil achievement" refers to a twenty percent annual increase movement toward attaining the national norm.

3. High Achieving Schools - Schools whose gains in reading and math average grade-point levels at the end of the 1980-81 term were in the upper one-third of the thirty-two (32) schools in the Area II school district.
4. Low Achieving Schools - Schools whose gains in reading and math average grade-point levels at the end of the 1980-81 term were in the lower one-third of the thirty-two elementary schools in the Area II school district.
5. Role Perception - Refers to the specific task of instructional leadership team either as the expectation of the team itself, and/or the expectation of the principal, and/or the expectation of the classroom teachers for whom the team provides leadership.
6. School Decisions - Those decisions that are greater in scope than a particular classroom, but not greater than a school.<sup>8</sup>
7. Self-Actualization - The desire for self-fulfillment: the desire to become everything one is capable of becoming.<sup>9</sup>
8. ECD - Elementary Curriculum Development project undertaken by the Atlanta Public School System in 1970 to revise and develop the system's elementary curriculum.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Duke, Showers, and Imber, "Teaching and Shared Decision Making", p. 93.

<sup>9</sup>Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation", p. 49.

<sup>10</sup>Atlanta Public Schools, "Management by Objectives", p. 1.

9. Principals - Subjects of this study comprising a group of persons who individually served in the capacity of chief administrator or head man or woman of an elementary school.
10. Leadership Team Chairpersons - Subjects of this study comprising a group of teachers who individually presided over the proceedings and decision-making processes of the leadership team in a particular school.
11. Leadership Team Members - Subjects of this study comprising a group of teachers identified in their respective school units to make school decisions.
12. Non-Leadership Team Members - Subjects of this study who served as regular classroom teachers without leadership team membership or responsibility.

#### Locale of the Study

The locale of this research was the Area II district of the Atlanta Public School System jurisdiction. Area II is populated by citizens of diverse socio-economic levels, and is therefore representative of the entire environs of the city of Atlanta.

The more immediate locale of this study included two-thirds of the elementary schools of Area II (approximately twenty) which were divided into two (2) groups: (a) "high-achieving schools" and (b) "low-achieving schools," characterized by being identified as the upper one-third and the lower one-third in achievement in the increase of grade-point average, respectively, in reading and mathematics during the 1980-81 school term among the thirty-two (32) elementary schools in the Area II school district.

#### Time Period of the Study

This study was conducted throughout the 1981-82 school



year.

### Description of Subjects

The subjects for this study were: (a) the leadership team chairpersons, (b) the principals, (c) randomly selected leadership team members, and (d) randomly selected non-leadership team members employed in twenty elementary schools in Area II of the Atlanta Public School System, numerically identified as: twenty (20) leadership-team chairpersons, twenty (20) principals, forty (40) randomly selected leadership team members, and forty (40) randomly selected non-leadership team members.

### Description of Materials/Instruments

1. Materials - The basic data on pupil performance on standardized tests in mathematics and reading, enrollment, attendance, and scholastic performance, wherever indicated, were derived from the records and reports for Area II schools of the Atlanta Public Schools.
2. Instruments - The instruments used were:
  - a. Leadership Team Questionnaire, consisting of seventy-nine (79) items, constructed, validated, and field-tested by researcher, designed to identify perceptions (characteristics) roles of leadership teams in the instructional and decision-making processes in the teaching learning situation.
  - b. Inventory by Everett L. Shostrom, Ph.D., to determine self-actualization characteristics or performances: Personal Orientation Inventory, which consists of 150 two-choice (paired opposites) comparative value judgments.

### Method of Research

The Descriptive-Survey Method of Research, utilizing

questionnaires, inventories, scholastic records and statistical analyses, was used to develop this study.

### Research Procedures

The procedural steps used in the conduct of this research were:

1. Obtain permission and approval of the appropriate officials to conduct the research and use the resources (personnel, records, and reports and other type resources of the school system wherever indicated).
2. Identify the target population as to location and stations.
3. Obtain the cooperation of the personnel (leadership team members, principals, and others) to be called upon to participate in gathering the data.
4. Procure data-gathering instruments:
  - a. Construct, validate and field-test questionnaires on perceptions of leadership team role.
  - b. Obtain commercial questionnaire Personal Orientation Inventory to measure teacher self-actualization.
  - c. Procure statistical records and/or reports on pupils' test results in Area II schools.
    - (1) Use California Achievement Test data (Spring, 1981) to determine the schools of Area II to include in the upper and lower third groups.
    - (2) Find the mean and standard deviation.
    - (3) Determine which schools are a half standard deviation plus (+) or minus (-) from the mean.
    - (4) Rank schools according to upper third and lower third placement.
5. Administer the questionnaires, inventories; review and consolidate data needs indicated by study.
6. Tabulate data from instruments and records in appropriate tables and charts with reference to number, percent, mean, and "t" difference as indicated by appropriate statistical measures and procedures.

- a. Establish percent of responses to determine instructional leadership and decision-making role patterns and performances, as perceived by:
  - (1) the principal
  - (2) the leadership team chairpersons
  - (3) the randomly selected teachers who are non-team members
- b. Establish percent of responses to determine the frequency of role performance actualized and/or observed by:
  - (1) leadership team chairpersons
  - (2) principals
  - (3) randomly selected teachers who are non-leadership team members
- c. Establish the difference between groups.
  - (1) Use the "t" value at the .05 level of confidence to determine the difference in the percent of frequency of reported performance of the leadership role:
    - (a) leadership team chairperson - principals
    - (b) leadership team chairpersons - non-leadership team members
    - (c) principals - non-leadership team members
- d. With data accruing from the Personal Orientation Inventory, employ the statistical method called analysis of variance for analyzing differences on the dependent variable of self-actualization as indicated by leadership team members and non-leadership team members of the upper third group and lower third group.
  - (1) Take into account any initial differences between the groups on pretest measures or any other measures of relevant independent variables.
  - (2) Analyze self-actualization scores for significant differences at the .05 level.

7. Preparation of appropriate sequence of cover letter, instrument distribution, record reviews, and monitor-conferences, closing date of data collection.
8. Preparation of these manuscripts
  - a. Narrative
  - b. Findings
  - c. Conclusions
  - d. Discussion
  - e. Recommendations
  - f. Implications
9. Professionally typed final copy of manuscript

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is concerned with an examination of the literature dealing with the interrelatedness of the basic concepts of team leadership, shared decision making, pupil performance and achievement, and self-actualization. Although much has been written and reported in the literature on each of these topics, this section will review only selected studies that tend to support the basic assumptions of this research.

Theoretical Framework

This study has a conceptual framework which embodies philosophical assumptions and management principles of some seminal thinkers on leadership. The concepts of team leadership and shared decision making relate closely to the philosophical assumptions of McGregor, Maslow, Herzberg, and others.

McGregor<sup>11</sup> advocates a trend away from omnipotence in the administration of a school and the development of a social climate wherein each member has confidence in the

---

<sup>11</sup>McGregor, "The Human Side of Enterprise," pp. 13-18.

integrity, motivation, ability, creativity and vitality of those to whom team goals are entrusted.

The assumptions that form the basis for McGregor's Theory Y strongly suggest the initiation of an administrative team. In McGregor's Theory Y, it is assumed that motivation, potential for development, and capacity for assuming responsibility are all present in people. It is the responsibility of management (or the leadership team wherein this concept is prevalent) to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves. Thus, according to McGregor, the main responsibility of a management team (or the leadership team) is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives.

The Scanlon Plan, developed by Joseph Scanlon, also incorporates the theory of effective participation necessary for a team approach. The plan suggests "a formal method providing an opportunity for every member of the organization to contribute brains and ingenuity as well as physical effort to the improvement of organizational effectiveness".<sup>12</sup>

The basis for developing vital, team-like characteristics in contemporary pluralistic America lies in the under-

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

standing and building of new interpersonal norms and skills. The new norms accept human collaboration and human diversity as basic facts for problem solving, survival, and growth. These norms support the intent that interpersonal and inter-group conflict should be confronted openly and dealt with collaboratively in a problem-solving way. They must be accompanied by particular interpersonal and group skills - skills such as communicating effectively in a two-way fashion, setting goals clearly, uncovering conflicts constructively, solving problems systematically, and making decisions collaboratively.<sup>13</sup>

A report from the principal's volunteer task force on the five-year Study of Educational Change and School Improvement, conducted by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., (IDEAL) conveys a similar philosophy:

We operate on the basic assumption that teachers can learn to make valid instructional decisions if allowed to make mistakes and learn from them. We believe, furthermore, that teachers will not change unless they are deeply involved in defining and assessing the school's goals and the methods of achieving those goals. Innovative decisions passed down from upper administrative echelons will, in the main, be subverted for many reasons, not the least of which is the fact that teachers must be emotionally involved and committed to a decision before it is effectively

---

<sup>13</sup>Richard A. Schmuck, "Development of Management Teamwork: National Overview." Paper presented at Educational Managers Annual Academy (5th, Wemme, Oregon, July 22, 1974).

implemented.<sup>14</sup>

The idea that pupils' growth and achievement are maximized through cooperative effort in decision making follows closely the convictions of Anthony, who notes:

Joint problem solving and decision making leads to innovative ideas. Think how many more ideas and solutions can be generated by six minds instead of one. If the administration is open and willing to use staff strengths, the system gets more for its money. In the last analysis teachers and administrators are in business for one thing: educating children.<sup>15</sup>

Pellicer and Nemeth further set a theoretical base for the team approach to the educational growth of pupils as they postulate:

Input from several administrators in the decision-making process within the school increases the probability for higher quality decisions and yields a high level of commitment to management decisions because decisions are shared by members of the team.<sup>16</sup>

The notion that the self-esteem and personal development of those participating in a team approach will be enhanced due to the importance of their own individual roles to the management process exemplifies the theses of Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, and others. In Maslow's terms

---

<sup>14</sup>Mary M. Bentzen and Association, Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974), pp. 67-68.

<sup>15</sup>Margaret Anthony, "An Inside View of Shared Leadership " Educational Leadership, (March, 1981), p. 488.

<sup>16</sup>Pellicer and Nemeth, "Tired of Carrying the World", p. 101.



the essentials for a person's growth or "self-actualization" are first the satisfaction of basic physical needs and then the satisfaction of psychological, esthetic, and emotional needs.<sup>17</sup>

Maslow has developed the idea of the self-actualizing person -- "a person who is more fully functioning and lives a more enriched life than does the average person. Such an individual is seen as developing and utilizing all of his unique capabilities, or potentialities, free of the inhibitions and emotional turmoil of those less self-actualizing."<sup>18</sup>

The need to develop one's innate talents and potentials is universal among the human species, according to Maslow, but each individual's collection of capacities is unique. Maslow holds that, "What a man can be, he must be, He must be true to his own nature."<sup>19</sup>

Maslow and other humanistic psychologists further hold that the self-actualized person has, compared to the non-self actualizing individual, the following personality characteristics: (1) free from crippling anxiety; (2) free from neurosis or psychosis; (3) less dogmatic; (4) superior

---

<sup>17</sup>Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation," p. 49.

<sup>18</sup>Williard B. Frick, Humanistic Psychology: Interviews with Maslow, Murphy, and Rogers (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971), p. 143.

<sup>19</sup>A.H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p. 46.

perception of reality; (5) less conformist and more inner-directed; (6) higher frequency of peak experiences (peak experiences are mystic feelings, feelings of wonder, awe, wholeness, which are dissociated from theological or supernatural interpretation); (7) increased acceptance of others; (8) more democratic; (9) more creative; (10) more spontaneous; (11) more healthy interpersonal relations; (12) increased identification with the human species; (13) more humanistic values; (14) ability to turn inward in a meditative way to solve personal problems; (15) more altruistic and loving; (16) greater appreciation for solitude and privacy; (17) a more witty, philosophic sense of humor; (18) more liberal on political, social and religious questions; (19) greater sense of purpose and meaning in life; more peace of mind and feelings of harmony with life and nature.<sup>20</sup>

Frederick Herzberg<sup>21</sup> in his famous "hygiene" theory suggests that while the "hygiene" factors (such as company policies and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary status, and security) are important, it is the growth or "motivation" factors (such as achievement, recognition, interesting work, in-

---

<sup>20</sup>Rod Farmer, "Humanism, Self-Actualization and Social Studies." The Social Studies, Volume 72, Number 5 (September/October, 1981), p. 209.

<sup>21</sup>Frederick Herzberg, "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Classics of Organizational Behavior, p. 49.

creased responsibility, promotion) that lead to improved job satisfaction and performance. Thus, the best way to motivate an employee is with challenging work in which responsibility can be assumed.

### Team Leadership

The importance of subordinate participation in the leadership of the school is given great emphasis in the literature. Campbell and others report:

The most effective teacher-administrative relationship, from the standpoint of morale and productivity, is a participative one. That is, a condition must exist whereby both administrators and teachers call upon each other to define the structure that increases their productivity in achieving the ends desired by their organization, the school.<sup>22</sup>

To further underscore the importance of team leadership, Jenson<sup>23</sup> and co-authors assert that an elementary school principal who would be successful in the development and management of the instructional program must know how to build a strong leadership team. To accomplish this, Jenson and co-authors consider essential the following elements:

First, the team must have a goal, purpose, cause or objective identified, accepted, understood,

---

<sup>22</sup>Roald F. Campbell, Edwin M. Bridges, and Raphael O. Nystrand, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), p. 254.

<sup>23</sup>Theodore J. Jenson, James B. Burr, William H. Coffield, and Ross L. Neagley, Elementary School Administration (2nd ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967), p. 433.

and desired by all members of the team.

Second, the team must have spirit, morale, and the desire to win even at considerable individual sacrifice.

Third, the lines of authority and responsibility must be both clearly defined and understood.

Fourth, channels of communication must be established.

Fifth, leadership must discover and utilize to the fullest extent the creative abilities of each of the individuals and weld them into a smooth working team.<sup>24</sup>

New responsibilities are placed on the principal to provide leadership for the organization of the leadership team. The leadership team, which may be comprised of instructional-level leaders (primary, intermediate, and upper) should assume the responsibility of providing leadership to a teaching group that is composed of both professional and paraprofessional personnel. In effect, team leaders assume many duties related to the improvement of instruction that the principal typically performs and/or for which he or she is accountable.

The principal has the primary responsibility of creating a climate of interdependence among the team members, according to Pellicer and Nemeth.<sup>25</sup> The nature of relationships between team members must be directed toward the success of the school, thus enhancing each individual's feeling

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 433-434.

<sup>25</sup>Pellicer and Nemeth, "Tired of Carrying the World," p. 98.

of goal achievement. The principal will be the participant in the creation of group goals while permitting each team member to exercise maximum motivation, ingenuity, and initiative.

To achieve maximum effectiveness from the leadership or management team, Pellicer and Nemeth offer the following guidelines to principals:

1. To keep teachers from feeling that some tasks delegated by the principal are unimportant, principals should retain some of the undesirable but necessary tasks such as discipline, maintenance, housekeeping, or attendance as a part of their own job.
2. Assure the inclusion of satisfying tasks, such as supervision of instruction, working with student or parent groups, or representing the school at public events in the job description for each member of the management team.
3. Some responsibilities cannot be delegated if the principal wishes to maintain leadership in the school. Final decisions in some areas such as staff selection, teacher evaluation, and the utilization of scarce resources may need to be made by the principal with input from team members.
4. Authority must be delegated to match responsibility. Team members cannot function effectively without the authority to make decisions in their areas of responsibility. Failure to delegate authority commensurate with responsibility will lead to the ultimate destruction of the management team through frustration and demoralization.<sup>26</sup>

Advocates of participation vary as to the amount of participation by subordinates which they believe are important. Some writers maintain that participation of subordi-

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 99-100.

nates is necessary throughout the total planned change process, as indicated in this report of supervisors and directors:

Continuous teacher participation should be planned for. The ideal situation is one in which gradually over a period of time a functional organization, suitable for a given institution, has been developed. Suitable organizational machinery will guarantee regular and effective participation of teachers. All will know what to expect in the way of privileges and responsibilities. This is not to say that machinery alone will do the trick. The point is that so important a matter as development of teacher leaders must not be left to chance. All must feel that they are partners in an enterprise. Operation must proceed on the basis of policies determined by the group if leadership is to be democratic enough to breed more leadership.<sup>27</sup>

The team management concept is reported to be successful in individual schools and school systems. In the Rio Linda School District, the superintendent and others believe that they have devised a model that is exciting and totally rewarding. They predict:

If you haven't implemented a management team approach, involving your total management staff in the decision-making process, you are missing perhaps the most fulfilling and exciting problem-solving process you will every enjoy in your profession. Even more regrettable, your student-constituents may eventually be short-changed more than you.<sup>28</sup>

It was concluded that the Rio Linda Management Team process allows each individual to be involved in the resolutions of problems affecting his/her professional role.

---

<sup>27</sup>The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association. Leadership at Work, Fifteenth Yearbook, (Washington, D.C., 1943), p. 47.

<sup>28</sup>Nick Floratos et al. "The Management Team and Survival," Thrust 8 (November, 1978): 5-6.

Working cooperatively, rather than competitively, the team process encourages its members to contribute their talents and ideas for the benefit of a common goal: the highest quality educational program for all children.<sup>29</sup>

In recent years, a plan embodying the idea of team leadership was implemented in the Mansfield, Connecticut public schools. The plan has special significance because much unlike schemes of "shared leadership" in business, in education, in industry, and in other areas, the Mansfield plan of shared leadership is genuine and effective, according to Weingast.<sup>30</sup>

Shared leadership activities in Mansfield involve teachers in conceiving and writing curricula, helping to screen and nominate professional staff, helping prepare the budget, scheduling classes, and bringing recommendations to the Board of Education.

Much of the success of shared leadership in the Mansfield schools is attributed to the fact that it requires "the parties to trust each other, that they be willing collaborators, that they have common goals, and that the sharing process be continuous."<sup>31</sup> Perhaps the ultimate endorse-

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>30</sup>David Weingast, "Shared Leadership -- 'The Damn Thing Works,'" Educational Leadership 37 (March, 1980): 502-503.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 504-505.

ment of the Mansfield program of shared leadership may be found in the remarks of one teacher spokesman who said, "I feel more respect as a person now."<sup>32</sup>

A strong endorsement of the team leadership or management concept is found in the conclusion of a comprehensive volume on organizations by Katz and Kahn.<sup>33</sup> These authors suggest that most organizations can profitably move toward decentralization, that there can be some shift of authority from officials to members, that distinctions between classes of citizenship can be reduced, and that role enlargement can often give a sense of greater participation.<sup>34</sup>

#### Shared Decision Making

A survey of the literature on teacher involvement in school decision making yielded few references that directly link involvement to student performance or outcomes. Teacher participation in decision making was related to more intrinsic factors such as job satisfaction, morale and self-actualization.

Duke and co-researchers<sup>35</sup> who conducted a study of teacher's perceptions of the potential costs and benefits

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 506.

<sup>33</sup>Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: Wiley, 1966), pp. 470-471.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 472.

<sup>35</sup>Duke, Showers, and Imber, "Teachers and Shared Decision Making", p. 93.



of involvement in school decision making speculate that teachers might not view participation in school decision making as a particularly desirable activity unless they consider that a specific shared decision making scheme has great potential for improvement of classroom life and student outcomes. Of fifty teachers interviewed, nineteen expressed the belief that higher quality decisions resulted when teachers were involved. Only ten teachers, however, actually stated that they felt shared decision making led to greater effectiveness or improved student outcomes.<sup>36</sup>

Bridges<sup>37</sup> notes that teachers do not want to participate in all decisions but have greatest interest in those which bear directly upon classroom affairs. He suggests that the principal who wishes to extend participation must first determine which matters fall within the range of teacher interest and expertise. A second step is to decide exactly what teachers should help do (define the problem, suggest alternative courses of action, or select one of the alternatives). Bridges emphasizes the importance of making these decision-making boundaries absolutely clear.

Bridges further suggests a third step, which is to determine the mode in which the decision-making group will operate. One mode is participant-determining, in which it

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>37</sup>Edward M. Bridges, "A Model for Shared Decision-Making in the Principalship," Educational Administration Quarterly 3 (Winter. 1967): 49-61.

is agreed that a decision is reached only when all members of the group achieve consensus. A second is the parliamentary mode where a decision is achieved when a majority of the group agree. The third mode is the democratic-centralist, in which one member retains the authority to decide after considering the views of others in the group. In each instance, the role of the administrator or the leadership team will vary.<sup>38</sup>

A report concerning teachers' participation in curriculum decision making in Chicago public schools attributes the success of the educational program to teacher involvement in curriculum development and program planning.<sup>39</sup> Success, it is assumed, means that learning conditions for students improve.

The assessment of teachers' roles in curriculum matters is reflected in the agreement between the Chicago Board of Education and the Chicago Teachers' Union which stipulates that classroom teachers shall have equal representation on curriculum writing and evaluating committees in all subject areas, as well as on textbook selection committees. The provision in part calls for:

Involvement of principal, staff, pupils, and school community in the discussion of meaningful curriculum objectives.

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 48-52.

<sup>39</sup>Jacquelyn B. Vaughn, "The Expanding Role of Teachers in Negotiating Curriculum," Educational Leadership (October, 1976), p. 21.

Principal-staff planning periods for the development of multi-purpose units of instruction and in-service training in the utilization of instructional materials and equipment available in all schools.<sup>40</sup>

In investigating team behavior in schools, Likert reported that teachers' participating in decision making is particularly related to work group performance, and presumably student performance.<sup>41</sup>

Likewise, Goodlad recognizes the impact of shared decision making on school performance in the following statement:

A large number of educational innovations instituted primarily to upgrade the academic performance of pupils have involved changes in the curricula in the performance of teachers, and in school organization. These innovations also necessitate important alterations in the roles of the teacher and principal and in the traditional authority structure of the school. Proposals to decentralize school systems and plans to increase community control of schools represent innovations that focus on changes in decision-making processes. Each of these innovations attempts to upgrade the performance of schools through modification of their basic organizational arrangements.<sup>42</sup>

In a report on the experience of initiating a participative decision making process in a large elementary school, Blumberg and others<sup>43</sup> observed that the newly created

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 22-23.

<sup>41</sup>Rensis Likert, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 92.

<sup>42</sup>John I. Goodlad, The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 151.

<sup>43</sup>Arthur Blumberg, William Wayson, and Wilford Weber. "The Elementary School Cabinet: Report of an Experience in Participative Decision-Making," Educational Administrative Quarterly, Volume 5, Number 3 (Autumn, 1969), pp. 32-52.

faculty cabinet became a decision-making body that could make decisions over the principal's objections. In spite of this, the cabinet was viable, and the principal did not lose his influence over the school. The authors suggest, therefore, that participative decision making in the schools can have the same kind of effect that Likert foresaw in industry: "the closer a system moves toward a participative model, the more productive it becomes."

Other related studies cited in the subsequent paragraphs reveal the impact of shared decision making in other areas, with broad implications for the relationship of shared decision making to student achievement and self-actualization.

Brown<sup>44</sup> describes a school design program that included parents, school staff, community residents and students in planning both a new building and the curriculum and teaching methods used in it. Brown concludes that teachers, parents, community members, and students all feel a part of the school because they were all involved in its planning. Brown states that the decision to include all elements of the school district in the planning is related to the theory that "individuals will thrive and produce proportionally more when given a greater degree of control over and input into a concept or project."

---

<sup>44</sup>Daniel L. Brown, "Total Client Involvement in School Design," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 56, Number 5 (January, 1975), pp. 349-351.

A study by Mann<sup>45</sup> of the effect of community involvement in decision making on student achievement has implications relating to the impact of teacher involvement in decision making on pupil performance. Mann cites a number of studies suggesting that increased community involvement can help school people accomplish specific goals. For Mann, all these goals are interrelated and affect each other. However, Mann admits that the effects of increased community involvement on student achievement are difficult to determine. He believes that citizens have not been involved sufficiently or long enough for dramatic or widespread gains in student achievement to occur. Nevertheless, he hypothesizes four paths through which involvement may affect achievement: parent self-efficacy or parents feeling more self-confident and therefore encouraging their children to achieve more; institutional/child congruence or schools being more responsive to the real needs of students who then perform better; community support, or a school receiving so much affective and financial support that it is able to help students achieve more; and student self-efficacy in which students, perceiving parents as accomplishing significant achievements in the schools, strive to emulate them.

---

<sup>45</sup>Dale Mann, "Ten Years of Decentralization: A Review of the Involvement of Urban Communities in School Decision-making," New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Columbia University, IRCD Bulletin, 10, 3 (Summer, 1975): 15-21.

### Self-Actualization

Experts in education from universities and other centers of research, coming from almost sixty countries and meeting in a world congress, studied the factors underlying self realization in education. The essential points presented through the various reports are: (1) All human beings have potentialities which should be developed to an optimum degree. (2) There is complete agreement that self realization is one of the most important questions throughout the world. (3) Self realization is a very complex problem which involves many conditions and which is affected by very diverse influences. (4) The problems which confront all educators and teachers in the realization of personality are manifold. (5) Educational research in relation to the problem of self actualization has shown itself to be of major importance.<sup>46</sup>

Achieving one's maximum potential is the psychological state to which individuals aspire when their basic needs for safety, love, and esteem have been satisfied, according to Maslow.<sup>47</sup> Urban principals, like other organizational participants, bring this self-actualization need to their role. The available evidence suggests that urban principals

---

<sup>46</sup>"Self Realization Through Education", Proceedings of the VIIth World Congress of the International Association for the Advancement of Educational Research (Gent, Belgium, July 25-29, 1977), pp. 140-53.

<sup>47</sup>Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation", p. 50.

achieve more self-actualization in their roles than their rural counterparts. Of the junior high school principals, 70 percent, of the senior high school principals, 59 percent in urban areas feel that their roles offer them either considerable or very much opportunity to use their unique capabilities and to realize their potential. Since the possibilities for self-fulfillment increase as one ascends the organizational hierarchy, the level of self-actualization experienced by principals presumably surpasses that of teachers.<sup>48</sup> A definitive test of this hypothesis remains to be made, however.

In a fairly technical report dealing with levels of decisional participation among teachers, Belasco and Alutto<sup>49</sup> concluded that satisfaction levels do vary, that teachers who were decisionally deprived were less satisfied than others, and that the results were mixed regarding the relation between satisfaction and organization outcomes.

A theoretical decision-making model by Cooke and Coughlan<sup>50</sup> relates to teacher self-actualization. The Cooke and Coughlan model recognizes two decision-making structures

---

<sup>48</sup>Chris Argyris. Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Row, 1957). p. 17.

<sup>49</sup>James A. Belasco and Joseph A. Alutto, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, 8, 1 (Winter, 1972), pp. 44-58.

<sup>50</sup>Robert A. Cooke and Robert J. Coughlan, "Survey Feedback and Problem Solving with Complementary Collection Decision Structures." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New Orleans, February, 1973, 39 pages.

in the school organization -- the authority (vertical) and the collective (horizontal). Authority decisions are made at the upper level of the administration; collective decisions are made by consensus of all the people involved no matter what their level. The authors call for the implementation of collective decision making to complement the authority method.

The model uses survey feedback and collective action to work on problems identified by the concerned group. The authors feel that their model will lead to greater teacher satisfaction with their roles.

Goldman<sup>51</sup> reports a study in which the impact of a faculty development workshop upon its participants' personality development was assessed by comparing twelve college professors attending an instructional improvement workshop with appropriate matched controls on changes in self-actualization as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI).

Faculty development, a generic term for attempts to improve teaching effectiveness, is described as "an institutional process which seeks to modify the attitudes, skills, and behavior of faculty members toward greater competence and effectiveness in meeting student needs, and the

---

<sup>51</sup>Jeffrey A. Goldman. "Effect of a Faculty Development Workshop Upon Self-Actualization," Education, 78, 3, (March/April 1978): 254-255.



needs of the institution."<sup>52</sup> The model of faculty development used in this study consisted of components based on issues in organizational, instructional, and personal development. Components based primarily on organizational development include: departmental management development, departmental team building, departmental conflict management, departmental decision making.

Results of the study indicated that workshop participants increased their scores on six of twelve scales of the POI, while control professors' scores remained the same. Thus, the study provides empirical support that faculty development workshops promote the self actualization of its participants.<sup>53</sup>

A similar workshop experience designed to help counselors develop greater self-awareness in regard to their own unfulfilled needs was conducted and reported by Garte and Rosenblum.<sup>54</sup> What began as workshops in leisure consciousness later evolved into development of exercises to help counselors become aware of their uses of leisure time and its potential for life and job enrichment. The workshop idea was recently expanded to include teachers during the

---

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 255.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., pp. 256-258.

<sup>54</sup>Sumner H. Garte and Mark L. Rosenblum, "Lighting Fires in Burned-Out Counselors," The Personnel Guidance Journal, 57, 3 (November, 1978): 158-160.

Chicago Teachers Union Conference "Life on the Job: How to Cope."

The relevance of Garte and Rosenblum's study is that a single vocation cannot be counted on to fulfill every need for personal identity, mastery, or achievement. In this regard, Garte and Rosenblum suggest that counselors and teachers diversify their activities to the extent that it becomes possible to focus on needs that are lacking. If unmet needs cannot realistically be addressed by modifying a work situation, the creative use of leisure time becomes mandatory to achieve self-actualization. The authors conclude that enthusiasm and zest for life are contagious. Similarly, boredom, routine, and lackluster attitudes are easily transmitted to others.

A study by Moyer<sup>55</sup> has findings relating to teacher satisfaction and role perceptions which have implications for teacher self-actualization. Moyer tested the hypothesis that "close correspondence between teachers' and principals' attitudes toward leadership will be associated with a high degree of teacher satisfaction." Some of the major findings are as follows:

1. The closer the correspondence of attitudes and needs toward leadership with a teaching group (group solidarity), the higher the overall satisfaction of the teachers in the group.

---

<sup>55</sup>Donald C. Moyer, "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Leadership as They Relate to Teacher Satisfaction," (Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1954), pp. 193-194.

2. The closer the members of a teaching group correspond in group-centered attitudes toward leadership, the higher the level of teacher satisfaction in the group.
3. The extent to which a principal defines his ideal principal as one who encourages teachers to be less dependent on him and more interdependent, the higher the overall satisfaction of the teachers in his group.<sup>56</sup>

While Moyer's study dealt more with teacher satisfaction than with role definition, the findings do imply that conflict in how one's role is perceived does affect the satisfaction and presumably the self-actualization and productivity of members of the organization.<sup>57</sup>

#### Pupil Achievement

The review of research identifying the important role of school administrators in the academic growth of students has relevance to team leadership in its decision-making role.

A study by Keeler and Andrews<sup>58</sup> found that leader behavior of second level leaders (principals and cadre leaders) is significantly related to test achievement of followers. The researchers stated that, "All of the statistics give strong support to the hypothesis that leader behavior of the principal, as perceived by his staff, was sig-

---

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., pp. 194-195.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 194.

<sup>58</sup>B.J. Keeler and J.H.M. Andrews, "The Leader Behavior of Principals, Staff Morale, and Productivity," Alberta Journal of Educational Research 9 (September, 1963): 179-191.

nificantly related to the productivity of the schools."<sup>59</sup>

Further corroboration can be found in a study of two New York inner-city schools. In an investigation by the New York Office of Education, it was found that important differences in pupil learning can occur between schools with nearly identical facilities, staff, and low income study enrollment. The report concludes:

The findings of this study suggest that the differences in pupils' reading achievement in these two schools were primarily attributable to administrative policies, behavior, procedures, and practices. Effectiveness of teaching, training, and experience of teachers, appropriateness and availability of materials, and approaches to teaching reading did not differ significantly between the schools. The abilities of the schools' administrative team, however, were very different. In School A, the principal and his assistant principals were able to run an orderly, peaceful, and efficient school with a high degree of cooperation from pupils, teachers, and parents. In this atmosphere, decisions based on educational criteria could be put in practice and children could learn more. In School B, the principal and his assistant principals had difficulty eliciting cooperation from staff, community, and pupils in implementing educational policy. Children in School B had less opportunity to learn.<sup>60</sup>

A report by Appel indicates that quality education is possible only through the leadership of educational administrators. The school leadership, according to Appel,

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., pp. 179-191.

<sup>60</sup>Office of Education Performance Review. "School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner-City Schools", (Albany, N.Y.: State of New York Office of Education, March, 1974), pp. 21-22.

should commit themselves to higher expectations of study performance. Appel further points out:

Most students are capable of mastering skills and concepts associated with advanced curriculum offerings, given the appropriate conditions of learning -- time, resources, environment, and motivation. Since we live in an age when science, technology, and communication between cultures is increasingly important, we need to develop more opportunities for students to learn these skills.<sup>61</sup>

Appel concludes that in order to obtain quality education, the educational leadership in the school must be committed to the improvement of the comprehensive curriculum; higher expectations and standards for students and staff; and creation of a learning climate which fosters and encourages growth in the school and the community.

Interest in curriculum development and implementation has as its focus the idea of curriculum as a vehicle for educational enhancement and a responsibility to the needs of students. In an article by Newton,<sup>62</sup> the question is asked, "Who is responsible for curriculum?" Newton suggests a team structure wherein each participant shares equally the successes and failures of the curriculum. The proposed structure consists of: (1) administrative personnel, (2) teachers, (3) community representatives, and (4) students.

According to Newton, a major outcome of curriculum

---

<sup>61</sup>Joseph M. Appel, "Public Education: Time for Commitment", Thrust, Vol. 10, No. 1, (October, 1980), pp. 31-32.

<sup>62</sup>James E. Newton, "Whose Responsibility is the Curriculum?" The Clearing House, Vol. 50, No. 2 (October, 1976), pp. 66-67.

should be that students have gained meaningful information which has the promise of future utility. Newton says in summary that curriculum development for the promotion of quality education is the role of all groups, be they administrative, faculty, staff, students, or concerned parents.

In recent years, American public education has been criticized following major reports by Averch<sup>63</sup> et al., in 1974, and Coleman<sup>64</sup> et al., in 1966, that our schools have not been effective in promoting student learning. These early reports of school effectiveness have recently been challenged in a report of the large-scale implementation of the Southwest Regional Laboratory/Ginn Kindergarten Program.<sup>65</sup>

The implementation of the SWRL/Ginn Kindergarten Program involved the use of a well developed instructional program in a large number of school districts over a long period of time. The conclusions of this research indicate that schools can have a positive and lasting effect on student achievement when effective instructional programs are

---

<sup>63</sup>H.A. Averch et al., "How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review of Research," Educational Technology, Vol. 14, No. 4 (April, 1974), pp. 22-25.

<sup>64</sup>J.S. Coleman et al., "Equality of Educational Opportunity" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), pp. 6-12.

<sup>65</sup>R.A. Hanson and R.E. Schutz, "A New Look at Schooling Effects from Programmatic Research and Development," in Making Change Happen, ed. D. Mann (New York: Teacher College Press, 1978), pp. 50-55.

properly implemented. These findings should have relevance to the school leadership or management team who is responsible for instructional coordination.

### Summary

The importance and interrelatedness of team leadership and shared decision making to pupil achievement and teacher self-actualization cannot be denied. The impact of the leader's behavior as a key element in establishing conditions for educational productivity and effective staff performance is strongly supported. This is true whether leadership is provided solely by the principal or by a leadership or management team.

A review of the related literature suggests the following: (1) theory supports the concept of team leadership and the development of working conditions and school climate to foster self-actualization; (2) the team leadership concept holds the possibility of making the process of administering the school more effective in terms of decision making, pupil performance, and teacher self-fulfillment; (3) the team concept necessitates alterations in the roles of the teacher and principal and the traditional authority structure of the school; (4) this change in the structure of organizational relationships presumably affects organizational behavior; (5) shared decision making provides a better opportunity for the success of the school program, which may be measured in terms of pupil growth and achievement; (6) input from an

administrative or leadership team in the decision-making process within the school increases the probability for higher quality decisions and yields a high level of commitment to management decisions because decisions are shared by members of the team; (7) the self-actualization, self-fulfillment, and sense of responsibility of those participating in a team approach will be enhanced due to the importance of their own individual roles to the management process; and (8) the productivity of a school is determined by its educational leadership.



## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In this chapter, the specific steps involved in the data gathering procedures are discussed. The discussion is divided into sections as follows: a) the population sample which constituted the subjects of this research; b) the data gathering instruments, which included the Leadership Team Questionnaire and the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI); and c) the statistical treatment of the data.

#### The Population Sample

The universe from which the population sample was taken was the Area II schools in the Atlanta Public School System as of 1980-81. The sample was selected from the top one-third and the lower one-third of the thirty-two elementary schools in Area II, according to the results of the 1981 California Achievement Tests. The sample itself consisted of twenty schools, ten in the upper one-third group and ten in the lower one-third group.

All the schools represented a cross-section of socio-economic status, which included the disadvantaged and lower middle-class areas within the geographical boundaries of which the Area II schools are assigned.

All schools included in the sample had a functioning

leadership team during the 1980-81 school term. The team consisted of the principal, a leadership team chairperson, the media specialist, and a teacher representative of each instructional level -- primary and intermediate levels in schools K-5, and primary, intermediate, and upper levels in schools K-7. Several of the schools had a parent representative as a member of the team.

For this study, the subjects included twenty principals, (ten in the top one-third group and ten in the lower one-third group); twenty leadership team chairpersons (ten in top one-third and ten in the lower one-third group); forty randomly-selected leadership team members (twenty in the top one-third and twenty in the lower one-third group); and forty randomly-selected non-leadership team members (twenty in the top one-third and twenty in the lower one-third group).

The researcher initially contacted the Area II superintendent of the Atlanta Public Schools to discuss the researcher's desire and intent to use the Area II schools in a study. The assistant superintendent of Area II schools was also apprised of the nature and purpose of the study. It was agreed that the results of the study would be reported confidentially, and that individual schools would not be identified as to their rank or to their responses to the questionnaires.

The next step involved seeking permission on the central office level to conduct the study. It was then neces-

sary to contact the assistant superintendent of Research, Evaluation, and Data Processing, who referred the matter to a research associate. The proposed study was approved several weeks after the researcher submitted to the Research, Evaluation, and Data Processing Division of the Atlanta Public Schools a prospectus and other required documents.

Building principals of the schools selected for the study were contacted to secure their cooperation and participation in the proposed research. A letter was mailed in early November, 1981, to the twenty principals, explaining the purpose, procedure, and expected outcomes.

In each school the following persons were requested to respond to the Leadership Team Questionnaire: 1) the principal; 2) the 1980-81 school term leadership team chairperson, who was to obtain a composite response from team members; and 3) two randomly selected non-leadership team members.

With respect to the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), persons who were asked to respond in each of the twenty schools included: 1) two randomly selected leadership team members who served during the 1980-81 school term, and 2) the same two non-leadership team members who responded to the Leadership Team Questionnaire.

No demographic data were gathered on the sample population. However, it is known that the subjects were both male and female of varying levels of experience.

### The Instruments

#### The Leadership Team Questionnaire

The Leadership Team Questionnaire consists of seventy-nine (79) items designed to identify perceptions of duties and functions of leadership teams in school decision-making processes. The questionnaire encompasses nine areas of school decision making: 1) instructional coordination, which subsumes sixteen items; 2) curriculum development, with nine items; 3) staff development. covering eighteen items; 4) evaluation, encompassing seven items: 5) general school improvement, with seven items; 6) personnel, covering six items; 7) rules and discipline. with three items; 8) general administration, encompassing nine items; and 9) policymaking, with four items.

To each specific item the respondent was asked to indicate the extent to which he or she agrees or disagrees with the item as an appropriate task or responsibility of the leadership team in its decision-making role. The respondent was then asked to rate each item by placing a check by the rating that best reflects the extent to which the leadership team in his or her school directly or indirectly engaged in or performed each task.

The instrument was field tested by securing the criticisms of qualified persons before the final form of the questionnaire was prepared and mailed out. A preliminary form of the questionnaire, prepared and tested before mailing in quantity, led to revision of certain items.

Validity of the Leadership Team Questionnaire was established by checking answers, in some cases, against evidence already on record. In a broader sense, validity was judged in light of the following types of evidence:

1. Analysis of the formulation of specific questions, as judged and tried out by various qualified persons.
2. Preliminary evaluation and tryout of the instrument to clear up any ambiguities.
3. Research and study extending over a long period of time that the items contained in each category were typical tasks or responsibilities.
4. Response to specific items during the tryout by a large enough proportion of respondents to permit the validity of items.
5. A reasonable range of responses to specific items during the tryout to permit validity.
6. Consistency of the obtained information with expectancy.<sup>66</sup>

#### The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI)

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), developed by Everett L. Shostrom in 1968 and revised in 1974, was used as the operationally defined measure of self-actualization. Based on Maslow's conceptualization of a "fully functioning person free of inhibitions and emotional turmoil," the POI yields two major scales and ten subscales considered important aspects of self-actualization. The two major scales deal with the effective use of time and inner-directedness;

---

<sup>66</sup>Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates. Methods of Research. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), pp. 623-624.

whereas the subscales address the areas of valuing, feeling, self-perception, awareness, and interpersonal sensitivity.

The POI consists of 150 two-choice comparative value and behavior judgments which provide two ratio scores: Time Incompetence/Time Competence and Outer Support/Inner Support, as well as scores on ten subscales: a) Self-Actualizing Value (SAV); b) Existentiality (Ex); c) Feeling Reactivity (Fr); d) Spontaneity (Sp); e) Self Regard (Sr); f) Self-Acceptance (Sa); g) Nature of Man (Nc); h) Synergy (Sy); i) Acceptance of Aggression (A); and j) Capacity for Intimate Contact (C).

Only the Time Competence (TC) and Inner Directed (I) scales were scored to obtain a quick estimate of the examinee's level of self-actualizing. It was recommended that scores from the Time Competence scale and the Inner Directed scale be used in preference to the ratio scores for correlational or other statistical analyses due to the statistical complexities of ratio scores.

The Time Competence scale of the POI was designed to measure a person's use of time. A self-actualizing person might be thought of as being competent in the use of time and appears to live more fully in the here-and-now. Non-self-actualizing persons are comparatively the most time incompetent. This marked time incompetence suggests that the non-self-actualizing person does not discriminate well between past or future. He is excessively concerned with the past or the future relative to the present.

The Inner-Directed support scale is designed to measure whether an individual's mode of behavior is characteristically "self" oriented (inner directed) or "other" oriented (outer directed). Inner, or self, directed persons are guided primarily by internalized principles and motivations, while other directed persons are to a great extent influenced by their peer group or other external forces. Self-actualizing people appear to have liberated themselves from rigid adherence to the social pressures and social expectations to which normal or non-self-actualizing people conform.

The Time Competence and Inner-Directed scales are scored for the positive or self-actualizing end of the continuums. Correlations among the scales also tend to be positive. Self-actualizing samples are significantly higher on all scales, and non-self-actualizing samples tend to be lower on all scores. In other words, high scores suggest that the individual is time competent and inner-directed, while low scores suggest that the individual is time incompetent and other-directed, having a tendency to submit to outside pressures.

The test of validity of the POI is that the instrument should discriminate between individuals who have been observed in their life behavior to have attained a relatively high degree of self-actualizing from those who have not shown such development. To test the validity of the POI, the instrument was administered to two groups, one of rela-

tively self-actualizing and the other of relatively non-self-actualizing adults. Results of this study reported by Shostrom in 1964 indicated that the POI significantly discriminates between clinically judged self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing groups on eleven of the twelve scales.<sup>67</sup>

#### Treatment of the Data

The statistical data derived from the responses to the Leadership Team Questionnaire and the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) used in this research were assembled, organized, and analyzed at a computer center in the locale of this study.

The data of the Leadership Team Questionnaire were used to ascertain the extent of agreement and disagreement among principals, leadership team members, and non-leadership team members of high and low achieving schools in regard to the appropriateness of the leadership team's decision-making responsibilities in nine categories. The results were expressed in terms of frequency and percent. In a similar manner the researcher used the data to show the frequency and percent of the engagement of the leadership team in decision-making activities in the nine categories, as observed by the principals, leadership team chairpersons,

---

<sup>67</sup>Everett L. Shostrom, Manual for the Personal Orientation Inventory (San Diego, California: EDITS (Educational and Industrial Testing Services), 1974, p. 23.



and non-leadership team members.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) one-way analysis of variance package was employed to determine non-chance variations among the means of the three groups -- principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members -- on sets related to instructional coordination, curriculum development, staff development, evaluation, general school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policymaking. The non-chance variations were accepted as statistically significant if the "t" values obtained were sufficiently large to indicate the probability  $P$  equal to or less than .05.

The "t" test was used to compare the mean scores of groups in high achieving and low achieving schools for statistical significance with respect to self-actualization. The hypothesis was accepted if the computed "t" value was equal to or greater than its critical value at the .05 level of confidence; the hypothesis was rejected if the computed "t" value was less than its critical value at the .05 level of confidence.

In addition, analysis of variance was employed in processing the data from the Personal Orientation Inventory. The purpose of the data analysis was to determine if significant differences exist between and among leadership team members and non-leadership team members in high achieving

and low achieving schools in regard to their scores on the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales. The non-chance variations were accepted or rejected as statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

### Specific Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the duties and tasks of the leadership team, as measured by the agreement/disagreement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

Instructional Coordination  
Curriculum Development  
Staff Development  
Evaluation  
General School Improvement  
Personnel  
Rules and Discipline  
General Administration  
Policymaking

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the performance of duties and tasks by the leadership team, as measured by the engagement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

Instructional Coordination  
Curriculum Development  
Staff Development  
Evaluation  
General School Improvement  
Personnel  
Rules and Discipline  
General Administration  
Policymaking

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the degree of self-actualization of leadership team member and non-leadership team members, as determined by the Time Competence and

Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

The rejection of these hypotheses would indicate that there is general agreement between the rationale of this study and the results within the limitations of the study. The acceptance of these hypotheses, on the other hand, may indicate some limitations in the sample or instruments. It may also indicate a need for reconsideration of the theoretical base of this study.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter of the research report contains the tables, analyses, and interpretations of data accruing from the seventy-nine (79) response items of the Leadership Team Questionnaire, encompassing nine categories: instructional coordination, curriculum development, staff development, evaluation, general school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policymaking.

The presentation in this chapter further reports the data resulting from the scores of the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), which provide a measure of one's self-actualization.

The collected data were statistically treated and interpreted with the appropriate degrees of freedom at the .05 level of confidence.

#### Presentation and Item Analysis of Data Resulting From the Leadership Team Questionnaire in Significant Categories

In this section an item analysis is presented of the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members regarding categories of tasks

and duties of the leadership team that proved significant in this study.

This analysis includes the items for seven scales of the Leadership Team Questionnaire on which some significance was found, and for which further statistics were computed. The categories (scales) in which some significance was generated are as follows: Instructional Coordination, Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, General Administration, and Policymaking. The two categories in which no significance occurred were: (1) Personnel and (2) Rules and Discipline. Thus, these two categories will not be analyzed in regard to frequency distributions and percentages.

#### Instructional Coordination

Table 1 presents the response of principals of high and low achieving schools to agreement/disagreement items in the category of instructional coordination.

An analysis of the data shows that in high achieving schools, ninety percent of the principals agreed with Item 2 (Coordinate compensatory education) and Item 8 (Review ECD units), whereas in low achieving schools only forty percent agreed with these respective items. Thirty percent of the principals in high achieving schools partly agreed with Item 9 (Use community resources), compared with fifty percent in low achieving schools partly agreeing with this item.

TABLE 1

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS IN  
HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS TO AGREEMENT/  
DISAGREEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF  
INSTRUCTIONAL COORDINATION ON THE  
LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools Principals(10) f(%)	Low Achieving Schools Principals(10) f(%)
1. Coordinate instructional budget	A	5(50)	3(30)
	PA	4(20)	3(30)
	PD	1(10)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	4(40)
2. Coordinate compensatory instruction	A	9(90)	4(40)
	PA	1(10)	4(40)
	PD	0(0)	1(10)
	D	0(0)	1(10)
3. Suggest materials	A	5(50)	6(60)
	PA	5(50)	3(30)
	PD	0(0)	1(10)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
4. Update inventory	A	8(80)	4(40)
	PA	1(10)	2(20)
	PD	1(10)	2(20)
	D	0(0)	2(20)
5. Schedule team meetings	A	9(90)	8(80)
	PA	1(10)	1(10)
	PD	0(0)	1(10)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
6. Facilitate functional meetings	A	9(90)	9(90)
	PA	1(10)	1(10)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
7. Recommend teacher assignment	A	5(50)	3(30)
	PA	2(20)	0(0)
	PD	0(0)	3(30)
	D	3(30)	4(40)

TABLE 1--Continued

Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools Principals(10) f(%)	Low Achieving Schools Principals(10) f(%)
8. Review ECD units	A	9(90)	4(40)
	PA	1(10)	4(40)
	PD	0(0)	2(20)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
9. Use community resources	A	6(60)	3(30)
	PA	3(30)	5(50)
	PD	1(10)	1(10)
	D	0(0)	1(10)
10. Fit program to community	A	8(80)	7(70)
	PA	2(20)	2(20)
	PD	0(0)	1(10)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
11. Determine in- structional levels	A	7(70)	4(40)
	PA	2(20)	3(30)
	PD	1(10)	1(10)
	D	0(0)	2(20)
12. Check teach- ing plans	A	5(50)	2(20)
	PA	2(20)	2(20)
	PD	0(0)	1(10)
	D	3(30)	5(50)
13. Help teach skills	A	6(60)	2(20)
	PA	4(40)	3(30)
	PD	0(0)	2(20)
	D	0(0)	3(30)
14. Help with group manage- ment	A	6(60)	4(40)
	PA	3(30)	4(40)
	PD	1(10)	2(20)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
15. Schedule classes	A	7(70)	5(50)
	PA	2(20)	2(20)
	PD	0(0)	2(20)
	D	1(10)	1(10)

TABLE 1--Continued

Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools	Low Achieving Schools
		Principals(10) f(%)	Principals(10) f(%)
16. Monitor pacing	A	7(70)	5(50)
	PA	1(10)	4(40)
	PD	1(10)	0(0)
	D	1(10)	1(10)

A = Agree  
 PA = Partly Agree  
 PD = Partly Disagree  
 D = Disagree

It is noteworthy that a smaller percent of the principals of high achieving schools indicated "Disagree" to the items in the category of instructional coordination. The highest percent of disagreement among principals in high achieving schools was thirty percent regarding Item 7 (Recommend teacher assignment) and Item 12 (Check teaching plans). The highest percent of disagreement in low achieving schools was fifty percent with Item 12.

A larger percent of principals of high achieving schools either agreed or partly agreed with items on the Instructional Coordination scale, in comparison with principals of low achieving schools who gave more responses of "Partly Agree" or "Disagree" with the items.



### Curriculum Development

Table 2 shows the response of principals, leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to agreement/disagreement items in the category of curriculum development.

In the further statistical computations to be reported later in this chapter, significant differences were found in the category of curriculum development between principals and non-leadership team members and between leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members.

An analysis of the results shows a larger percentage of non-leadership team members in high achieving schools partly agreeing with items than principals of high achieving schools. In low achieving schools non-leadership team members tended to partly disagree with items more than the principals. In both high and low achieving schools, leadership team members tended to agree with items more than non-leadership team members.

In high achieving schools ninety percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 7 (Share ECD information); only forty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with this item. Wide discrepancies were also detected in the response of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members of high achieving schools to these items: Item 3 (Set tone for curriculum); Item 4 (Implement individualized learning program); Item 6 (Decide

TABLE 2

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS, LEADERSHIP. TEAM CHAIRPERSONS AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS TO AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools			Low Achieving Schools		
		Prin- cipals(10) f(%)	LT Chair- persons(10) f(%)	Non-LTM (20) f(%)	Prin- cipals(10) f(%)	LT Chair- persons(10) f(%)	Non-LTM (20) f(%)
1. Develop teaching units	A	3(30)	2(20)	1(5)	1(10)	3(30)	3(15)
	PA	3(30)	2(20)	8(40)	4(40)	2(20)	4(20)
	PD	3(30)	4(40)	6(30)	3(30)	1(10)	8(40)
	D	1(10)	2(20)	5(25)	2(20)	4(40)	5(25)
2. Conduct curriculum activities	A	7(70)	3(30)	8(40)	6(60)	6(60)	9(45)
	PA	3(30)	7(70)	8(40)	3(30)	4(40)	3(15)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	0(0)	4(20)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	0(0)	4(20)
3. Set tone for curriculum	A	7(70)	6(60)	5(25)	5(50)	5(50)	8(40)
	PA	7(70)	3(30)	11(55)	5(50)	4(40)	5(25)
	PD	0(0)	1(10)	3(15)	0(0)	0(0)	4(20)
	D	1(10)	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(10)	3(15)
4. Implement individualized learning	A	6(60)	8(80)	8(40)	3(30)	4(40)	9(45)
	PA	4(40)	2(20)	10(50)	5(50)	5(50)	8(40)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	2(20)	1(10)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)

TABLE 2--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools			Low Achieving Schools		
		Prin- cipals (10) f(%)	LT Chair- persons (10) f(%)	Non-LTM (20) f(%)	Prin- cipals (10) f(%)	LT Chair- persons (10) f(%)	Non-LTM (20) f(%)
5. Foster human relations	A	6(60)	5(50)	8(40)	3(30)	5(50)	5(25)
	PA	1(10)	5(50)	6(30)	5(50)	5(50)	9(45)
	PD	3(30)	5(50)	4(20)	2(20)	0(0)	4(20)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)
6. Decide which sub- ject to individ- ualize	A	6(60)	6(60)	7(35)	3(30)	2(20)	7(35)
	PA	3(30)	3(30)	9(45)	4(40)	4(40)	5(25)
	PD	1(10)	1(10)	3(15)	3(30)	3(30)	3(15)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(10)	5(25)
7. Share ECD informa- tion	A	8(80)	9(90)	9(45)	6(60)	8(80)	14(70)
	PA	2(20)	1(10)	9(45)	2(20)	2(20)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(10)	0(0)	1(5)
8. Use ser- vices of teacher aide	A	6(60)	7(70)	7(35)	2(20)	5(50)	7(35)
	PA	2(20)	3(30)	7(35)	5(50)	4(40)	6(30)
	PD	2(20)	0(0)	4(20)	2(20)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	2(20)	1(10)	1(10)	7(35)
9. Provide scope and sequence charts	A	9(90)	8(80)	13(65)	7(70)	7(70)	13(65)
	PA	0(0)	1(10)	7(35)	2(20)	3(30)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	1(10)	0(0)	1(10)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	1(10)	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)

TABLE 2--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools			Low Achieving Schools		
		Prin- cipals(10) f(%)	LT Chair- persons(10) f(%)	Non-LTM (20) f(%)	Prin- cipals(10) f(%)	LT Chair- persons(10) f(%)	Non-LTM (20) f(%)

A = Agree  
 PA = Partly Agree  
 PD = Partly Disagree  
 D = Disagree

LT = Leadership Team  
 Non-LTM = Non-Leadership Team Member

which subjects to individualize); Item 8 (Use services of teacher aides); and Item 9 (Provide scope and sequence charts).

In low achieving schools, there was less difference in the percent of response of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to items of agreement. Fifty percent of the leadership team chairpersons in low achieving schools agreed with Item 5 (Foster human relations) in comparison with twenty-five percent of non-leadership team members in agreement with this item.

Also, fifty percent of leadership team members agreed with Item 8 (Use services of teacher aides), while thirty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed.

There were other differences observed in the two groups. In the low achieving schools, forty percent of the leadership team chairpersons disagreed with Item 1 (Develop teaching units); only twenty-five percent of non-leadership members disagreed with this item. On the other hand, ten percent of the leadership team chairpersons partly disagreed with Item 1, while forty percent of the non-leadership team members partly disagreed with this item.

Thirty-five percent of non-leadership team members disagreed with Item 8 (Use services of teacher aides), while only ten percent of leadership team chairpersons disagreed with this item. Forty percent of leadership team chairpersons also partly agreed with Item 2 (Conduct curriculum activities), in comparison with fifteen percent of non-

leadership team members responding "partly agree" to this item.

Table 2 also shows the response of principals and non-leadership team members to the agreement/disagreement items in the category of curriculum development.

In high achieving schools seventy percent of the principals agreed with Item 3 (Set tone for curriculum); in response to same item only twenty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed. Twenty percent of the principals partly agreed with this item, while fifty-five percent of non-leadership team members partly agreed.

In response to Item 6 (Decide which subjects to individualize), sixty percent of the principals in high achieving schools agreed with this item, in comparison with thirty-five percent of non-leadership members. Eighty percent of the principals agreed with Item 3 (Share ECD information), while forty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed.

Other differences noted were in Item 8 (Use services of teacher aide) and Item 9 (Provide scope and sequence charts). Sixty percent of the principals of high achieving schools agreed with Item 8, while ninety percent agreed with Item 9. On the other hand, only thirty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with Item 8, and sixty-five percent agreed with Item 9.

Differences in responses of principals and non-leader-

ship team members in low achieving schools were also noted. Forty percent of the principals partly agreed with Item 1 (Develop teaching units), while twenty percent of non-leadership team members partly agreed. Thirty percent of the principals partly agreed with Item 2 (Conduct curriculum activities), in comparison with fifteen percent of non-leadership team members who partly disagreed.

Fifty percent of the principals indicated "partly agree" to Item 8 (Use services of teacher aides), while thirty percent of the non-leadership team members gave a similar response to this item. It is interesting to note also that thirty-five percent of non-leadership team members responded "disagree" to this item in comparison to only ten percent of the principals who disagreed.

#### Staff Development

Table 3 presents data regarding responses of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to agreement/disagreement items in the category of staff development on the Leadership Team Questionnaire.

Leadership team chairpersons in high achieving schools were one hundred percent in agreement with Item 2 (Hold meetings), Item 4 (Identify in-service needs), and Item 8 (Maintain records). Correspondingly, seventy-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with Item 2, fifty-five percent on Item 4, and sixty percent on Item 9.

Other discrepancies appeared between leadership team

TABLE 3

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS TO AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
1. Develop leadership plan	A	7(70)	11(55)	10(100)	12(60)
	PA	3(30)	7(35)	0(0)	5(25)
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)
2. Hold meetings	A	10(100)	15(75)	10(100)	14(70)
	PA	0(0)	4(20)	0(0)	5(25)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)
3. Orient staff	A	8(80)	14(70)	10(100)	13(65)
	PA	2(20)	5(25)	0(0)	5(25)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)
4. Identify inservice needs	A	10(100)	11(55)	10(100)	14(70)
	PA	0(0)	7(35)	0(0)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)



TABLE 3--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
5. Plan staff activities	A	9(90)	11(55)	8(80)	15(75)
	PA	1(10)	8(40)	2(20)	1(5)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)
6. Obtain inservice resources	A	9(90)	7(35)	7(70)	15(75)
	PA	1(10)	9(45)	3(30)	3(15)
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	1(5)
7. Stay "on call" to teachers	A	5(50)	7(35)	5(50)	6(30)
	PA	4(40)	5(25)	1(10)	4(20)
	PD	1(10)	6(30)	3(30)	5(25)
	D	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	5(25)
8. Maintain records	A	10(100)	13(65)	8(80)	13(65)
	PA	0(0)	6(30)	1(10)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	1(10)	2(10)
9. Coordinate staff ECD representation	A	8(80)	12(60)	3(30)	9(45)
	PA	2(20)	5(25)	5(50)	7(35)
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	1(10)	3(15)

TABLE 3--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
10. Implement simulated learning model	A	7(70)	9(45)	4(40)	8(40)
	PA	2(20)	5(25)	5(50)	4(20)
	PD	1(10)	2(10)	2(20)	6(30)
	D	0(0)	2(10)	2(20)	2(10)
11. Read professional literature	A	6(60)	9(45)	6(60)	10(50)
	PA	4(40)	7(35)	3(30)	6(30)
	PD	0(0)	3(15)	1(10)	2(10)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)
12. Review individualized subject areas	A	4(40)	6(30)	6(60)	9(45)
	PA	5(50)	8(40)	4(40)	9(45)
	PD	1(10)	6(30)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)
13. Follow up workshop experiences	A	9(90)	9(45)	5(50)	11(55)
	PA	1(10)	7(35)	5(50)	6(30)
	PD	0(0)	3(15)	0(0)	2(10)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)
14. Respond to check-lists	A	5(50)	7(35)	8(80)	7(35)
	PA	3(30)	8(40)	1(10)	1(5)
	PD	2(20)	3(15)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	2(10)

TABLE 3--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
15. Compile checklist	A	6(60)	10(50)	8(80)	8(40)
	PA	3(30)	6(30)	0(0)	7(35)
	PD	1(10)	2(10)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	2(10)	2(20)	4(20)
16. Post ECD model	A	8(80)	10(50)	7(70)	10(50)
	PA	2(20)	5(25)	1(10)	7(35)
	PD	0(0)	4(20)	1(10)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	1(10)	3(15)
17. Support staff presentations	A	8(80)	9(45)	7(70)	11(55)
	PA	2(20)	8(40)	3(30)	6(30)
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	3(15)
18. Recognize teachers	A	8(80)	13(65)	8(80)	13(65)
	PA	2(20)	5(25)	2(20)	5(25)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)

A = Agree  
 PA = Partly Agree  
 PD = Partly Disagree

D = Disagree  
 LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  
 NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members

chairpersons and non-leadership team members in high achieving schools with respect to Item 5 (Plan staff activities); Item 6 (Obtain inservice resources); Item 9 (Follow up workshop experiences); Item 16 (Post ECD model); and Item 17 (Support staff presentations). Ninety percent of leadership team chairpersons agreed with Items 5 and 6, while fifty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with Item 5 and thirty-five percent agreed with Item 6. Only forty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with Item 13; ninety percent of leadership team chairpersons agreed with Items 16 and 17. A mere fifty percent of non-leadership team members agreed with Item 16, while forty-five percent agreed with Item 17.

In low achieving schools there was one hundred percent agreement by the leadership team chairpersons on Item 1 (Develop leadership plan); Item 2 (Hold meetings); Item 3 (Orient staff); and Item 4 (Identify inservice needs). On the other hand, sixty percent of non-leadership team members agreed with Item 1; seventy percent with Items 2 and 4; and sixty-five percent with Item 3.

Also, eighty percent of leadership team chairpersons in low achieving schools agreed with Item 14 (Respond to checklists), while only thirty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with this item. Partly agreeing with this item were fifty percent of non-leadership team members and ten percent of leadership team members.

To Item 15 (Compile checklists), eighty percent of

leadership team chairpersons agreed, while forty percent of non-leadership team members agreed.

### Evaluation

Data on the perceptions of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to agreement/disagreement items in the category of evaluation are presented in Table 4.

The data indicate that in high achieving schools the response of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members varied on five of the items: Item 1 (Develop evaluative instruments); Item 2 (Evaluate individualized program); Item 3 (Plan conferences); Item 5 (Evaluate teachers); and Item 7 (Use evaluative findings).

Sixty percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 1; only thirty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with this item. Eighty percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 2, in comparison to forty-five percent of the non-leadership team group. To Item 3, ninety percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed, while only sixty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed.

Seventy percent of the leadership team chairpersons indicated agreement with Item 5; thirty-five percent of the non-team members agreed to this item. While one hundred percent of the leadership team members agreed with Item 7, a mere fifty percent of the non-leadership team members

TABLE 4

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS TO AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF EVALUATION ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Description	Rating	Staff Development			
		High Achieving Schools LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	Low Achieving Schools LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
1. Develop evaluative instruments	A	6(60)	7(35)	6(60)	10(50)
	PA	3(30)	6(30)	2(20)	6(30)
	PD	0(0)	3(15)	2(20)	2(10)
	D	1(10)	4(20)	0(0)	2(10)
2. Evaluate individualized program	A	8(80)	9(45)	5(50)	10(50)
	PA	2(20)	8(40)	2(20)	9(45)
	PD	0(0)	3(15)	3(30)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)
3. Plan conferences	A	9(90)	13(65)	7(70)	14(70)
	PA	0(0)	6(30)	2(20)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	1(10)	0(0)
	D	1(10)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)
4. Maintain diagnostic folders	A	8(80)	15(75)	8(80)	13(65)
	PA	2(20)	4(20)	2(20)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	3(15)

TABLE 4

Item Description	Rating	Staff Development			
		High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
5. Evaluate teachers	A	7(70)	7(35)	5(50)	9(45)
	PA	3(30)	7(35)	4(40)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	3(15)
	D	0(0)	4(20)	0(0)	4(20)
6. Use checklists and report cards	A	6(60)	13(65)	6(60)	9(45)
	PA	4(40)	4(20)	2(20)	7(35)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	2(20)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	3(15)	0(0)	3(15)
7. Use evaluative findings	A	10(100)	10(50)	6(60)	11(55)
	PA	0(0)	8(40)	3(30)	5(25)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	1(10)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	4(20)

A = Agree  
 PA = Partly Agree  
 PD = Partly Disagree  
 D = Disagree

LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  
 NLTC = Non-Leadership Team Members

agreed.

It was also noted in high achieving schools that twenty percent of the non-leadership team members disagreed with Item 1 (Develop evaluative instruments) and Item 5 (Evaluate teachers). No leadership team chairperson disagreed with Items 1 and 5.

The data revealed fewer discrepancies between leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members in low achieving schools. Twenty percent of the leadership team chairpersons partly agreed with Item 2, in comparison with forty-five percent of non-leadership team members partly agreeing with this item.

The data further show that twenty percent of the non-leadership team members in low achieving schools disagreed with Items 5 and 7, whereas there was no disagreement among leadership team chairpersons on these items.

#### General School Improvement

Table 5 presents the data on the responses of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members to items in the category of general school improvement.

The data show that in high achieving schools principals and leadership team chairpersons indicated differences in agreement on Item 1 (Organize Advisory Council); Item 2 (Use parental involvement materials); Item 3 (Communicate school plan); Item 4 (Publicize school's program); and Item



TABLE 5

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS, LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS TO AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF GENERAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools			Low Achieving Schools		
		Principals(10) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	Principals(10) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
1. Organize Advisory Council	A	7(70)	10(100)	10(50)	5(50)	5(50)	9(45)
	PA	3(30)	0(0)	7(35)	1(10)	3(30)	5(25)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	2(20)	1(10)	2(10)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	2(20)	1(10)	4(20)
2. The paren- tal in- volvement materials	A	5(50)	9(90)	10(50)	4(40)	5(50)	11(55)
	PA	5(50)	1(10)	8(40)	4(40)	5(50)	6(30)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	2(20)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)
3. Communicate school plan	A	7(70)	9(90)	11(55)	6(60)	8(80)	13(65)
	PA	3(30)	1(10)	7(35)	3(30)	2(20)	2(10)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(10)	0(0)	2(10)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)
4. Publicize school's program	A	4(40)	6(60)	8(40)	4(40)	6(60)	10(50)
	PA	4(40)	2(20)	9(45)	4(40)	2(20)	4(20)
	PD	1(10)	2(20)	1(5)	0(0)	2(20)	3(15)
	D	1(10)	0(0)	2(10)	2(20)	0(0)	3(15)

TABLE 5--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools			Low Achieving Schools		
		Principals(10) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	Principals(10) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
5. Create school climate	A	10(100)	10(100)	14(70)	8(80)	9(90)	16(80)
	PA	0(0)	0(0)	5(25)	2(20)	1(10)	1(5)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)
6. Build pro- fessional library	A	7(70)	9(90)	14(70)	5(50)	7(70)	13(65)
	PA	2(20)	0(0)	4(20)	4(40)	3(30)	4(20)
	PD	1(10)	1(10)	2(10)	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)
7. Be a model for pupils	A	9(90)	9(90)	18(90)	7(70)	9(70)	15(75)
	PA	1(10)	1(10)	2(10)	3(30)	1(10)	2(10)
	PD	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(10)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(10)	2(10)

A = Agree  
 PA = Partly Agree  
 PD = Partly Disagree  
 D = Disagree

LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  
 NLTC = Non-Leadership Team Members

6 (Build professional library).

Seventy percent of the principals agreed with Item 1; one hundred percent of leadership team chairpersons agreed with this item. In response to Item 2, fifty percent of the principals agreed and fifty percent partly agreed, whereas ninety percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with this item. Ninety percent of the leadership team persons agreed with Item 3, in comparison with seventy percent of the principals. In response to Item 4, forty percent of the principals, respectively, agreed and partly agreed. Sixty percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with this item. Whereas ninety percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 6, only seventy percent of the principals agreed with this item, with twenty percent partly agreeing.

In low achieving schools the data show that leadership team members and principals differed on fewer items in the category of general school improvement. Forty percent of the principals agreed with Item 4, with forty percent partly agreeing. Sixty percent of the leadership team members agreed with this item, while twenty percent partly agreed.

The analysis of the data on the responses of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to items subsumed under the category of school administration, as shown in Table V, also revealed differences that were computed to be significant.

In high achieving schools, one hundred percent of the

leadership team members agreed with Items 1 and 5, while only fifty percent of the non-leadership team members agreed with Item 1 and seventy percent with Item 5.

Wide discrepancies were shown in responses to Items 2, 3, and 4. Ninety percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Items 2 and 3, while only fifty percent of the non-leadership team members agreed with Item 2, and fifty-five percent with Item 3. Sixty percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 4, with twenty percent respectively, partly agreeing and partly disagreeing. Forty percent of the non-leadership team members agreed with Item 4, and forty-five percent partly agreed.

The data further show that in low achieving schools eighty percent of the leadership team members agreed with Item 3; sixty-five percent of the non-leadership team members also agreed with this item. In response to Item 7, ninety percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed, while seventy-five percent of non-leadership members agreed.

#### General Administration

The data on the perception of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members relating to agreement/disagreement items in the category of general administration are presented in Table 6.

The data show that leadership team chairpersons in high achieving schools indicated one hundred percent agreement with Item 1 (Develop plan of action); Item 2 (Keep

TABLE 6

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS TO AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools		
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	
1. Develop plan of action	A	10(100)	17(85)	9(90)	17(85)	83
	PA	0(0)	1(5)	1(10)	1(5)	
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	0(0)	
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)	
2. Keep parents informed	A	10(100)	15(75)	9(90)	17(85)	
	PA	0(0)	3(15)	1(10)	1(5)	
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	1(5)	
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	
3. Construct management plan	A	9(90)	11(55)	8(80)	12(60)	
	PA	1(10)	8(40)	2(20)	4(20)	
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)	
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	
4. Display management plan	A	9(90)	10(50)	8(80)	10(50)	
	PA	1(10)	6(30)	1(10)	4(20)	
	PD	0(0)	4(20)	1(10)	2(10)	
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	4(20)	
5. Review orders	A	5(50)	7(35)	2(20)	6(30)	
	PA	1(10)	9(45)	5(50)	8(40)	
	PD	3(30)	4(20)	3(30)	3(15)	
	D	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	

TABLE 6--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
6. Work with monitoring team	A	8(80)	12(60)	7(70)	15(75)
	PA	1(10)	5(25)	1(10)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	3(15)	2(20)	0(0)
	D	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)
7. Serve as ECD spokesman	A	7(70)	11(55)	6(60)	5(25)
	PA	3(30)	5(25)	3(30)	6(30)
	PD	0(0)	3(15)	0(0)	5(25)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	1(10)	4(20)
8. Involve pupils	A	7(70)	8(40)	7(70)	9(45)
	PA	2(20)	9(45)	3(30)	7(35)
	PD	1(10)	3(15)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	4(20)
9. Review progress	A	10(100)	14(70)	7(70)	14(70)
	PA	0(0)	5(25)	3(30)	4(20)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	0(0)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)

A = Agree  
 PA = Partly Agree  
 PD = Partly Disagree  
 D = Disagree

LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  
 NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members

parents informed); and Item 9 (Review progress). In response to these items, eighty-five percent of the non-leadership team members agreed with Item 1; seventy-five percent agreed with Item 2; and seventy percent agreed with Item 9.

While ninety percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 3 (Construct management plan) and Item 4 (Display management plan), only fifty-five percent of the non-leadership team members agreed with Item 3 and fifty percent with Item 4. The data also show a distribution of responses by non-leadership team members to Item 4 and 5. Thirty percent of non-leadership team members partly agreed with Item 4, while twenty percent partly disagreed. Forty-five percent partly agreed with Item 5, with twenty percent partly disagreeing. Only ten percent of the leadership team chairpersons partly agreed with Item 5; thirty percent partly disagreed.

The analysis of the data shows that in low achieving schools, sixty percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 7 (Serve as ECD spokesman), while twenty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed. Also, seventy percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 8 (Involve pupils), while only forty percent of the non-leadership team members agreed.

Twenty percent of the non-leadership team members in low achieving schools disagreed with Items 4, 7, and 8. No leadership team chairpersons disagreed with Items 4 and 8;

however, ten percent disagreed with Item 7.

In Table 7 the frequency and percentage of responses to engagement items by leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members are presented.

In high achieving schools one hundred percent of the leadership team chairpersons responded "Often" to engagement in Item 1 (Develop plan of action) and Item 2 (Keep parents informed). Seventy-five percent of non-leadership team members indicated "Often" to Item 1, with sixty-five percent indicating "Often" to Item 2 and twenty-five percent responding "Usually" to this item. Seventy percent of the leadership team chairpersons indicated "Often" to Item 3 (Construct management plan); fifty percent of the non-leadership team members responded "Often" to this item.

Other variations in high achieving schools were on Item 5 (Review orders), Item 6 (Work with monitoring team), and Item 7 (Serve as ECD spokesman). Thirty percent of the leadership team chairpersons indicated "Often" to Item 5, while seventy percent of non-leadership team members responded "Often" to this item. On the same item sixty percent of the non-leadership team members indicated "Seldom/ Never", while twenty percent responded "Seldom/ Never" in the non-leadership team group. In response to Item 6, eighty percent of the leadership team chairpersons indicated "Often"; fifty percent of non-leadership team members responded "Often" to this item. Sixty percent of leadership team chairpersons indicated "Often" to engagement in Item 7,



TABLE 7

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS AND NON-  
LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS TO ENGAGEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF  
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
1. Develop plan of action	O	10(100)	15(75)	7(70)	15(75)
	U	9(0)	3(15)	3(30)	2(10)
	OC	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)
	S/N	9(0)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)
2. Keep parents informed	O	10(100)	13(65)	8(80)	14(70)
	U	0(0)	5(25)	2(20)	3(15)
	OC	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	1(5)
	S/N	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)
3. Construct management plan	O	7(70)	10(50)	7(70)	11(55)
	U	2(20)	7(35)	2(20)	4(20)
	OC	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	1(5)
	S/N	1(10)	1(5)	0(0)	4(20)
4. Display management plan	O	3(30)	7(35)	2(20)	6(30)
	U	2(20)	4(20)	7(70)	6(30)
	OC	3(30)	3(15)	0(0)	0(0)
	S/N	2(20)	6(30)	1(10)	8(40)

TABLE 7--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
5. Review orders	O	3(30)	7(70)	4(40)	5(25)
	U	2(20)	4(40)	2(20)	3(15)
	OC	3(30)	3(30)	2(20)	3(15)
	S/N	2(20)	6(60)	2(20)	9(45)
6. Work with monitoring team	O	8(80)	10(50)	6(60)	12(60)
	U	1(10)	6(30)	2(20)	3(15)
	OC	0(0)	2(10)	1(10)	2(10)
	S/N	1(10)	2(10)	1(10)	3(15)
7. Serve as ECD spokesman	O	6(60)	8(40)	6(60)	6(30)
	U	3(30)	6(30)	2(20)	2(10)
	OC	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	6(30)
	S/N	1(10)	4(20)	2(20)	6(30)
8. Involve pupils	O	5(50)	6(30)	6(60)	6(30)
	U	4(40)	7(35)	2(20)	7(35)
	OC	1(10)	5(25)	0(0)	1(5)
	S/N	0(0)	2(10)	2(20)	6(30)
9. Review progress	O	9(90)	14(70)	6(60)	13(65)
	U	1(10)	4(20)	2(20)	3(15)
	OC	0(0)	1(5)	1(10)	1(5)
	S/N	0(0)	1(5)	1(10)	3(15)

TABLE 7--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10)	NLTM(20)	LTC(10)	NLTM(20)
		f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)
<div> <div> O = Often  U = Usually  OC = Occasionally  S/N = Seldom/Never </div> <div> LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members </div> </div>					

with forty percent of non-leadership team responding "Often" to this item. To the same item, forty percent of the non-leadership team members indicated "Seldom/Never", while only ten percent of leadership team chairpersons responded "Seldom/Never" to this item.

In low achieving schools seventy percent of the leadership team chairpersons responded "Often" to Item 1; fifty-five percent of non-leadership team members indicated "Often" to this item. On this same item, twenty percent indicated "Seldom/Never" in the non-leadership team group; no leadership team members responded "Seldom/Never" to this item.

Discrepancies were shown in response to other items. On Item 4 (Display management plan), seventy percent of the leadership team chairpersons indicated "Usually"; thirty percent of the non-leadership team members indicated "Usually" to this item. On the same item, forty percent of the non-leadership team members indicated "Seldom/Never", while ten percent of leadership team members responded "Seldom/Never" to this item.

Sixty percent of the leadership team members indicated "Often" to Item 7; only thirty percent of non-leadership team members indicated "Often" to this item. On this same item thirty percent of the non-leadership team members indicated "Occasionally", while no leadership team members indicated "Occasionally" to this item.

Also on Item 8 (Involve pupils), sixty percent of the leadership team members in low achieving schools indicated

"Often"; thirty percent of the non-leadership members indicated "Often" to this item.

### Policymaking

Data in Table 8 indicate the frequency and percentage of responses by leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members in the category of policymaking.

In Table 8, the data show that seventy percent of the leadership team chairpersons in high achieving schools agreed with Item 1 (Recommend policy); forty-five percent of the non-leadership team members agreed with this item, with forty percent partly agreeing. In response to Item 3 (Suggest special policy), seventy percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed, while only fifty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed.

In low achieving schools, fifty percent of the leadership team chairpersons agreed with Item 1 and fifty percent partly agreed; forty-five percent of non-leadership team members agreed with this item; fifteen percent partly agreed; ten percent partly disagreed, and thirty percent disagreed.

The data further reveal that on each of the four items in the category of policymaking, non-leadership team members disagreed: Item 1, thirty percent; Item 2, twenty percent; Item 3, fifteen percent; Item 4, twenty-five percent. No leadership team chairpersons in low achieving schools disagreed on these items.

TABLE 8

ITEM RESPONSE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS AND NON-LEADER-SHIP TEAM MEMBERS TO AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ITEMS IN THE CATEGORY OF POLICYMAKING ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)	LTC(10) f(%)	NLTM(20) f(%)
1. Recommend policy	A	7(70)	9(45)	5(50)	9(45)
	PA	2(20)	8(40)	5(50)	3(15)
	PD	1(10)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)
	D	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	6(30)
2. Determine inter-mediate-level policy	A	6(60)	10(50)	5(50)	8(40)
	PA	4(40)	8(40)	5(50)	6(30)
	PD	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	2(10)
	D	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	4(20)
3. Suggest special	A	7(70)	11(55)	7(70)	9(45)
	PA	3(30)	7(35)	3(30)	7(35)
	PD	0(0)	2(10)	0(0)	1(5)
	D	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)
4. Establish policy for pupil evaluation	A	5(50)	9(45)	6(60)	9(45)
	PA	2(20)	5(25)	4(40)	3(15)
	PD	2(20)	4(20)	0(0)	3(15)
	D	1(10)	2(10)	0(0)	5(25)

TABLE 8--Continued

Item Description	Rating	High Achieving Schools		Low Achieving Schools	
		LTC(10)	NLTM(20)	LTC(10)	NLTM(20)
		f(%)	f(%)	f(%)	f(%)
<div> <div> A = Agree  PA = Partly Agree  PD = Partly Disagree  D = Disagree </div> <div> LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members </div> </div>					

Presentation and Analysis of Data on Means and  
"t" Values Resulting from the Leadership  
Team Questionnaire

Tables 9 through 12 serve as the basis of the analysis of Hypothesis 1. The means and "t" values were computed for the various groups in nine categories -- instructional coordination, curriculum development, staff development, evaluation, general school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policymaking. The groups examined for significant differences were as follows: principals and leadership team chairpersons, principals and non-leadership team members, leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members, and the total sample population (principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members).

Table 9 reports the results of the analysis of scores of principals and leadership team chairpersons on items of agreement/disagreement on the Leadership Team Questionnaire. On the General Improvement scale, a t-value of -2.14 was generated, which proved significant at the .05 level. No significant difference was found on the other eight scales. Hence, the General Improvement scale was the only one in this comparative data which yielded a statistically significant score.



TABLE 9

MEANS AND t-VALUES OF SCORES ON THE ITEMS OF  
 AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ON THE LEADERSHIP  
TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS VS.  
LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS

Scale	X Principals(20)	X Leadership Team Chairpersons(20)	t-Value
Instructional Coordination	3.29	3.36	-.424
Curriculum Development	3.31	3.38	-.523
Staff Development	3.48	3.65	-1.39
Evaluation	3.45	3.59	-.889
General School Improvement	3.50	3.73	-2.14*
Personnel	3.03	3.25	-1.04
Rules and Discipline	3.60	3.78	-1.13
General Administration	3.47	3.70	-1.85
Policymaking	3.53	3.52	.08

\*Significant at the .05 level

Table 10 examines the significance of scores of principals and non-leadership team members on items of agreement/disagreement on the nine scales of the Leadership Team Questionnaire.

TABLE 10

MEANS AND t-VALUES OF SCORES ON THE ITEMS OF  
AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ON THE LEADERSHIP  
TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS VS.  
NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

Scale	X Principals(20)	X Non-Leadership Team Members(40)	t-Value
Instructional Coordination	3.29	3.17	.766
Curriculum Development	3.31	3.00	2.10*
Staff Development	3.48	3.27	1.37
Evaluation	3.45	3.24	1.18
General School Improvement	3.50	3.36	.95
Personnel	3.03	2.99	1.96
Rules and Discipline	3.60	3.57	.139
General Administration	3.47	3.34	1.00
Policymaking	3.53	3.07	2.54*

\*Significant at the .05 level

As seen in Table 10, the Curriculum Development and the Policymaking scales generated "t" values of 2.10 and 2.54, respectively. These values are statistically significant at the .05 level. These were the only scales in the comparative data of principals and non-leadership team members on the Leadership Team Questionnaire to show statistical significance.

Table 11 reports the results of the analysis of scores of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members on agreement/disagreement items on the Leadership Team Questionnaire. The following scales produced "t" values that were significant at the .05 level: Curriculum Development (2.74), Staff Development (3.03), Evaluation (2.01), General School Improvement (2.78), General Administration (2.61) and Policymaking (2.55). Significant differences in the responses of the leadership team chairpersons and the non-leadership team members were, therefore, noted on six of the nine scales of the Leadership Team Questionnaire.

No significant difference on the following scales were noted in Table 11 in regard to agreement/disagreement with items by leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members: Instructional Coordination, Personnel, and Rules and Discipline.

TABLE 11  
MEANS AND t-VALUES OF SCORES ON THE ITEMS  
OF AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ON THE  
LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Scale	X Leadership Team Chairs (20)	X Non-Leadership Team Members (40)	t-Value
Instructional Coordination	3.36	3.17	1.34
Curriculum Development	3.38	3.00	2.74*
Staff Development	3.65	3.27	3.03*
Evaluation	3.59	3.24	2.01*
General School Improvement	3.79	3.36	2.78*
Personnel	3.25	2.99	1.30
Rules and Discipline	3.78	3.57	1.60
General Administration	3.70	3.34	2.61*
Policymaking	3.52	3.07	2.55*

\*Significant at the .05 level

Table 12 reports the results of the analysis of the responses of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members in high and low achieving schools with respect to agreement/disagreement with items on the Leadership Team Questionnaire. The analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in response on only one scale (Instructional Coordination) in the principals' group. A "t" value of 2.23 was reported on the Instructional Coordination scale for the principals' group, which proved significant at the .05 level.

In the comparison of groups on items of agreement/disagreement on the Leadership Team Questionnaire, the data indicate significance on the following scales: General School Improvement (Table 9); Curriculum Development (Tables 10 and 11); Policymaking (Tables 10 and 11); Staff Development (Table 11); Evaluation (Table 11); General School Improvement (Table 11); General Administration (Table 11); and Instructional Coordination (Table 12).

Therefore, Hypothesis 1, in relation to these categories, that:

There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the duties and tasks of the leadership team, as measured by the agreement/disagreement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Instructional Coordination, Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, General Administration, and Policymaking

is rejected.

TABLE 12

MEANS AND t-VALUE FOR PRINCIPALS, LEADERSHIP TEAM  
CHAIRPERSONS, AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS  
ON THE AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT ITEMS OF THE  
LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Scale	Groups	High Achieving Schools-Mean	Low Achieving Schools-Mean	t-Value
Instructional Coordination	P	56.9	48.5	2.23*
	LTC	55.3	52.4	.82
	NLTM	52.5	48.9	1.22
Curriculum Development	P	31.3	28.3	1.69
	LTC	31.3	29.6	1.04
	NLTM	27.7	26.3	.72
Staff Development	P	65.9	59.4	1.82
	LTC	67.1	64.4	1.18
	NLTM	59.3	58.5	.22
Evaluation	P	25.6	22.7	1.95
	LTC	26.0	24.3	1.07
	NLTM	22.8	22.6	.14
General School Improvement	P	25.5	23.5	1.80
	LTC	26.9	25.4	1.56
	NLTM	24.2	22.9	.87
Personnel	P	18.9	17.5	0.79
	LTC	20.5	18.6	1.00
	NLTM	17.8	18.1	-.23
Rules and Discipline	P	11.3	10.3	1.17
	LTC	11.6	11.1	1.14
	NLTM	11.0	10.4	.86
General Administration	P	32.0	30.6	.83
	LTC	33.7	32.9	.45
	NLTM	30.8	29.3	.88
Policymaking	P	14.3	14.0	.34
	LTC	13.9	14.3	-0.50
	NLTM	13.0	11.5	1.29

P = Principals  
LTC = Leadership Team Chairperson  
NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members

\*Significant at the .05  
level of confidence

No significance was found on two scales: (1) Personnel and (2) Rules and Discipline.

Therefore, Hypothesis 1, in relation to these two scales (1) Personnel and (2) Rules and Discipline, is accepted.

Tables 13-16 present the data for the analysis of Hypothesis 2.

TABLE 13

MEANS AND t-VALUES OF SCORES ON THE ITEMS OF  
ENGAGEMENT ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTION-  
NAIRE FOR PRINCIPAL VS. LEADERSHIP  
TEAM CHAIRPERSONS

Scale	X Principals(20)	X Non-Leadership Team Chairperson(40)	t-Value
Instructional Coordination	2.7	2.85	-0.669
Curriculum Development	2.7	2.84	-0.677
Staff Development	3.05	3.22	-.825
Evaluation	2.97	3.17	-.794
General School Improvement	3.17	3.41	-1.55
Personnel	2.63	2.89	-.919
Rules and Discipline	3.30	3.46	-.695
General Administration	3.18	3.47	-1.51
Policymaking	2.77	2.91	-.504

On analyzing the scores in Table 13, no significance was found.

TABLE 14  
MEANS AND t-VALUES OF SCORES ON THE ITEMS OF  
ENGAGEMENT ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTION-  
NAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS VS. NON-LEADER-  
SHIP TEAM MEMBERS

Scale	$\bar{X}$ Principals(20)	$\bar{X}$ Non-Leadership Team Members(40)	t-value
Instructional Coordination	2.7	2.79	-0.435
Curriculum Development	2.7	2.65	.212
Staff Development	3.05	2.92	.598
Evaluation	2.97	2.92	.255
General School Improvement	3.17	3.06	.634
Personnel	2.63	2.67	-.196
Rules and Discipline	3.30	3.21	.370
General Administration	3.18	3.05	-1.51
Policymaking	2.77	2.61	.64

Table 14 reports the results of the analysis of scores of principals and non-leadership team members on engagement in items on the Leadership Team Questionnaire. No significant difference in scores was determined for any of the scales.



TABLE 15

MEANS AND t-VALUES OF SCORES ON THE ITEMS OF  
 ENGAGEMENT ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTION-  
 NAIRE FOR LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSONS  
 VS. NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

Scale	$\bar{X}$ LTC	$\bar{X}$ NLTM	t-Value
Instructional Coordination	2.85	2.79	.338
Curriculum Development	2.84	2.65	.967
Staff Development	3.22	2.92	1.52
Evaluation	3.17	2.92	1.09
General School Improvement	3.41	3.06	1.98
Personnel	2.89	2.67	.853
Rules and Discipline	3.46	3.21	1.177
General Administration	3.47	3.04	2.33*
Policymaking	2.91	2.61	1.12

\*Significant at the .05 level

LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  
 NLTC = Non-Leadership Team Members

Table 15 examines the scores of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members on engagement in items on the Leadership Team Questionnaire. A "t" value of 2.33 was generated on the General Administration scale, which proved significant at the .05 level.

Table 16 compares the responses of principals, leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members in high and low achieving schools with respect to engagement in items on the Leadership Team Questionnaire. No statistically significant difference in responses was detected for any of the groups on any of the scales.

Analysis of the data indicates significance on only one scale (General Administration) when the groups were compared on the items of engagement on the Leadership Team Questionnaire.

No significance was shown on the following scales: Instructional Coordination, Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, Personnel, Rules and Discipline, and Policymaking.

Therefore, Hypothesis 2, in relation to these categories, that:

There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the performance of duties and tasks by the leadership team, as measured by the engagement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Instructional Coordination, Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, Personnel, Rules and Discipline and Policymaking).

is accepted.

TABLE 16

MEANS AND t-VALUE FOR PRINCIPALS, LEADERSHIP TEAM  
CHAIRPERSONS, AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS  
ON THE ENGAGEMENT ITEMS OF THE  
LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Scale	Groups	High Achieving Schools-Mean	Low Achieving Schools-Mean	t-Value
Instructional Coordination	P	47.6	39.0	1.60
	LTC	46.8	44.6	.44
	NLTM	45.7	43.5	.63
Curriculum Development	P	26.2	22.4	1.41
	LTC	25.8	25.4	.15
	NLTM	24.9	22.9	.92
Staff Development	P	59.1	50.7	1.57
	LTC	61.0	55.0	1.20
	NLTM	54.7	50.7	.83
Evaluation	P	23.0	18.7	2.07
	LTC	23.6	20.8	1.11
	NLTM	20.8	20.1	.39
General School Improvement	P	23.2	21.1	1.62
	LTC	25.4	22.4	1.92
	NLTM	22.5	20.4	1.15
Personnel	P	16.6	15.0	.69
	LTC	19.4	15.3	1.73
	NLTM	16.1	16.0	.03
Rules and Discipline	P	10.8	9.0	1.78
	LTC	11.1	9.7	-1.49
	NLTM	9.8	9.4	.48
General Administration	P	29.5	27.8	2.40
	LTC	32.2	30.4	.71
	NLTM	28.6	26.3	1.12
Policymaking	P	12.0	10.2	3.78
	LTC	12.4	10.9	.91
	NLTM	10.9	10.0	.73

P = Principals  
LTC = Leadership Team Chairpersons  
NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members

Presentation and Analysis of Data Resulting  
from the Personal Orientation Inventory

Tables 17 through 20 serve as the basis for the analysis of Hypothesis 3.

Table 17 reports the results of analysis of the responses of leadership team members in high and low achieving schools to items on the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory. The analysis reports a mean score of 19.0 on the Time Competence scale for leadership team members of high achieving schools and a mean score of 14.6 for those of low achieving schools. On the Inner Directed scale, the mean score was 110.5 for leadership team members of high achieving schools and 88.2 for those of low achieving schools.

The analysis reports "t" values on each scale (Time Competence, 4.63 and Inner Directed, 6.58) to be statistically significant beyond the .001 level.

TABLE 17

MEANS AND t-VALUES FOR LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS IN  
HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS WITH RESPECT TO  
THE TIME COMPETENCE AND INNER DIRECTED SCALES  
OF THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

Scale	Group (N)	Mean	t-Value	2-Tail Probability
Time Competence	High (20)	19.0	4.63	.000*
	Low (20)	14.6		
Inner Directed	High (20)	110.5	6.58	.000*
	Low (20)	88.2		

\*Significant beyond .001 level

TABLE 18

MEANS AND t-VALUES FOR HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING NON-  
LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS ON TIME COMPETENCE AND  
INNER DIRECTED SCALES OF THE PERSONAL  
ORIENTATION INVENTORY

Scale	Group (N)	Mean	t-value	2-Tail Probability
Time Competence	High (20)	14.2	-.63	.53
	Low (20)	15.0		
Inner Directed	High	81.3	.48	.63
	Low	79.6		

Table 18 analyzes the results of the responses of non-leadership team members in high and low achieving schools to items on the Time Competence and the Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

The analysis indicates a mean score of 14.2 on the Time Competence scale for non-leadership team members in high achieving schools, while those in low achieving schools had a mean score of 15.0. On the Inner Directed scale, the mean score for non-leadership team members in high achieving schools was 81.3. The mean score on the Inner Directed scale for non-leadership team in low achieving schools was 79.6.

No statistically significant difference in responses was detected for the Time Competence scale nor the Inner Directed scale.

Table 19 reports the results of analysis of the response of leadership team members and non-leadership team members in high and low achieving schools to items on the Time Competence scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

The results revealed statistically significant (.05 level) F values of 5.789 and 8.222.

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DEGREE OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION FOR LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS BY THE TIME COMPETENCE SCALE OF THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY IN HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS

Source of Variation(N)	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	$\bar{X}^2$	F-Value	Significance of F
Main Effect	161.255	2	80.612	7.005	.002
High vs. Low (40)	66.612	1	66.612	5.789	.019*
LTM-NLTM (40)	94.672	1	94.62	8.222	.005*

\*Significant at the .05 level

LTM = Leadership Team Members  
NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members

Table 20 further reports an F-value of 59.383, which is significant beyond the .001 level. The mean scores are significantly different for leadership team members and non-leadership team members to items on the Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

There is statistically significant difference of leadership team members and non-leadership team members on both scales - Time Competence (Table 19) and Inner Directed (Table 20).

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DEGREE OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION FOR LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS AND NON-LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS BY THE INNER DIRECTED SCALE OF THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY IN HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS

Source of Variation(N)	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	X	F-Value	Significance of F
Main effect	10017.324	2	5008.660	41.743	.000
High vs. Low (40)	2892.012	1	2892.012	24.102	.000*
LTM-NLTM (40)	7125.305	1	7125.309	59.383	.000*

\*Significant beyond .001 level

LTM = Leadership Team Members  
NLTM = Non-Leadership Team Members

Significance was found in the t-values of the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of leadership team members in high and low achieving schools (Table 17). No significance was found in the t-values for non-leadership team members of high and low achieving schools (Table 18). Statistical significance was revealed in the analysis (Tables 19 and 20) of the responses of leadership team members and non-leadership team members on both the Time Competence and the Inner Directed scales.

Therefore, Hypothesis 3, that:

There is no significant difference in the degree of self-actualization of leadership team members and non-leadership team members, as determined by the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory

is rejected.

In summary, the overall data appear to warrant the following findings:

Hypothesis 1 is rejected that:

There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the duties and tasks of the leadership team, as measured by the agreement/disagreement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Instructional Coordination, Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, General Administration, and Policy-making).

The null hypothesis, in relation to the categories of Personnel and Rules and Discipline, is accepted.



Hypothesis 2 is accepted that:

There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the performance of duties and tasks by the leadership team, as measured by the engagement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Instructional Coordination, Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, Personnel, Rules and Discipline, and Policymaking).

The null hypothesis, in relation to the category of General Administration, is rejected.

Hypothesis 3 is rejected that:

There is no significant difference in the degree of self-actualization of leadership team members and non-leadership team members, as determined by the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is concerned with the possible impacts of the leadership team's duties, responsibilities, and activities in decision making on teacher self-actualization and pupil achievement. More specifically, an attempt was made to identify the specific instructional leadership and decision making role patterns and performances in nine categories -- instructional coordination, curriculum development, staff development, evaluation, general school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policymaking -- as perceived by principals, leadership team members, and non-leadership team members. Furthermore, an attempt was made to determine the extent of self-actualization which leadership team members derive from functioning in the role of leadership team members.

The research sample for this study was drawn from ten high achieving and ten low achieving schools in Area II of the Atlanta Public Schools, as revealed by the 1980-81 results of the California Achievement Tests. The subjects included twenty (20) leadership team chairpersons who each submitted an individual team's composite response to the

Leadership Team Questionnaire. Others responding to this questionnaire from the high and low achieving schools were twenty (20) principals and forty (40) non-leadership team members (teachers).

The Personal Orientation Inventory was administered to forty (40) leadership team members and the forty-non-leadership team members (teachers) previously identified.

The Leadership Team Questionnaire is a 79-item instrument that is comprised of nine areas of school decision making: instructional coordination, curriculum development, staff development, evaluation, general school improvement, personnel, rules and disciplines, general administration, and policymaking. The instrument, developed by this researcher, was designed to identify perceptions of duties and functions of leadership teams in school decision-making processes.

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) consists of 150 two-choice items, yielding among other measures two major scales - Time Competence and Inner Directed. The Time Competence (TC) and Inner Directed (I) scales were scored to obtain a quick estimate of the examinee's level of self-actualizing.

Specific Hypotheses. The problem and its solution posed by this research were formulated around three (3) hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and

non-leadership team members of the duties and tasks of the leadership team, as measured by the agreement/disagreement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

Instructional Coordination  
Curriculum Development  
Staff Development  
Evaluation  
General School Improvement  
Personnel  
Rules and Discipline  
General Administration  
Policymaking

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members of the performance of duties and tasks by the leadership team, as measured by the engagement items comprising the nine scales of decision making on the Leadership Team Questionnaire:

Instructional Coordination  
Curriculum Development  
Staff Development  
Evaluation  
General School Improvement  
Personnel  
Rules and Discipline  
General Administration  
Policymaking

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the degree of self-actualization of leadership team members and non-leadership team members, as determined by the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

### Summary

The findings of this study are as follows:

1. There are significant differences in the response of principals and leadership team chairpersons to agreement/disagreement items in the category of General School Improvement on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 9).

2. There are significant differences in the response of principals and non-leadership team members to agreement/disagreement items in the categories of Curriculum Development and Policymaking on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 10).
3. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to agreement/disagreement items in a majority (six) of the nine categories (Curriculum Development, Staff Development, Evaluation, General School Improvement, General Administration, and Policymaking) on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 11).
4. There are significant differences in the response of principals in high and low achieving schools to agreement/disagreement items in the category of Instructional Coordination on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 12).
5. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members to engagement items in the category of General Administration on the Leadership Team Questionnaire (Table 15).
6. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team members in high and low achieving schools to items on the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Table 17).
7. There are significant differences in the response of leadership team members and non-leadership team members to items on the Time Competence and Inner Directed scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Tables 19 and 20).

### Discussion

The findings of this study warrant the following discussion.

This study focuses on pupil achievement and teacher self-actualization in relation to the activities and functions of the leadership team. The data relating to the three hypotheses of this study were treated in reference to

high and low achieving schools.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 are concerned with the perceptions of principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members in regard to the role patterns, duties, and performance of the leadership team in nine categories of decision making: instructional coordination, curriculum development, staff development, evaluation, general school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policymaking.

The data showed general agreement among the three groups on specific duties and tasks in each category. However, significant differences were revealed in perceptions of what the leadership team is expected to do and what it actually does.

The data revealed significant differences in the perceptions of principals and leadership team chairpersons in the category of general school improvement (Table 9); between principals and non-leadership team members in the categories of curriculum development and policymaking (Table 10); between leadership team members and non-leadership team members in the categories of instructional coordination, curriculum development, staff development, evaluation, general school improvement, general administration, and policymaking (Tables 11 and 15); and between principals of high and low achieving schools in the category of instructional coordination (Table 12).

While the differences detected in the perceptions of

leadership team's tasks and performance of duties are significant a certain amount of disagreement on role expectations should be expected in the elementary school. Teachers, principals, students, parents, PTA officials, central office staff differ in their needs and demands as they relate to the school. Therefore, the differences revealed in this study between principals and leadership team chairpersons in the category of school improvement, and those significant differences between principals and non-leadership team members in the categories of curriculum development and policymaking, as well as the differences between principals of high and low achieving schools in the category of instructional coordination, are not surprising, but cannot be ignored.

Differences of perceptions of leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members on the decision-making role of the leadership team in six categories -- instructional coordination, curriculum development, evaluation, general school improvement, general administration and policymaking (Table 11) -- should be explored for the possible impacts on pupil achievement, as well as teacher self-actualization. The crucial point, in the researcher's opinion, is the fact that these two groups (leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members) are the practitioners or instructional personnel who interact with pupils on a systematic basis. These persons have a key role in fostering (nurturing) pupil achievement and depict-

ing some evidence of self-actualization themselves.

Focusing on this particular finding in this study (significant differences in perception of the leadership team's role by the practioners, leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members) may provide some insight concerning school achievement and teacher self-actualization.

First of all, leadership team chairpersons and members, in many instances, are selected or appointed by the principal. In some situations leadership team chairpersons and members are selected through a democratic process. Nevertheless, being a member of the leadership team advances one to a position which sometimes generates envy and oftentimes ridicule among the peers.

To be chosen a leadership team member is an honor that cannot be denied. Leadership team members, the chairperson in particular, usually have role perceptions which do not differ markedly from those of the principal. As a member of the leadership team, the teacher becomes a part of the principal's cabinet or a member of management. It stands to reason, therefore, that fewer differences were found in this study between principals and leadership team chairpersons.

An examination of the data of this study (Table 5) showed that a higher percentage of leadership team chairpersons agreed with items in the category of general school improvement than the principals in both high and low achiev-



ing schools. A possible rationale for this is that leadership team members wished to satisfy the set of expectations related to their role.

Research studies have suggested that the ability to perceive and satisfy the set of expectations associated with the duties and functions of one's role is a great challenge. In this regard, Getzels has indicated:

Roles are defined in terms of role expectations. A role has certain normative obligations and role responsibilities, which may be termed "role expectations", and when the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities, into effect, he is said to be performing his role. The expectations define for the actor, whoever he may be, what he should or should not do as long as he is the incumbent of the particular role.<sup>68</sup>

Another possible explanation for the findings of this study is that there is a feeling expressed by teachers that the leadership team's decision making is a formality or an attempt to create the illusion of teacher influence. Teachers perceive the principal or central office personnel as the real decision makers, and therefore, doubt whether their involvement in decision making actually makes any difference.

Parity in decision making may be an issue or concern. There are some who feel that decisions are closer to the administrative realm (such as schedules, requests for addi-

---

<sup>68</sup>Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process," Administration Theory in Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: The Midwest Administration Center University of Chicago, 1958), p. 153.

tional monies, etc.) and that these might be decided with greater weight given to the principal. Other matters that are closer to the teacher, such as curriculum, classroom supplies, etc., might have greater leadership team influence.

Relevant to the discussion at this point is the finding that there was significant difference on the Instructional Coordination scale (Table 12) of the perceptions of principals in high and low achieving schools.

Leadership provided by the principal is very important. In spite of the functioning of a leadership team, the principal is still considered the change agent and instructional leader of the school. In this role there are certain types of activities or actions, such as classroom observation, in which the principal is expected to participate if he or she is to function as the instructional leader.

The instructional program comprises all of the factors and conditions within a school that influence learning. The teacher, although not the only factor, is most certainly the most important instructional variable affecting student learning. Therefore, in reference to the findings of this study, this researcher feels that the principal's perceptions of his role in regard to utilizing resources of instructional expertise, such as the leadership team, in his supervision and leadership of the instructional program most certainly will have an influence on student learning.

In relating the findings to Hypotheses 1 and 2, it can

be said that an important determinant of the leadership team's impact on pupils and teachers is the expectations important others, such as principals and non-leadership team members, have for the team as the decision making body of the school. Of further importance is the extent to which these role expectations agree with each other and agree with how the team feels it needs to perform. Generally speaking, reasonable agreement and mutual understanding of areas of agreement and disagreement seem to be prerequisite for leadership team effectiveness.

Another consideration in regard to Hypotheses 1 and 2 relates to problems of a different kind that confront the leadership team. In addition to an inadequate role description, insufficient released time, lack of time or salary compensation for increased responsibilities, and little or no in-service training for their role represent obstacles that stand in the way of the leadership functioning as a viable decision-making body. The leadership team cannot be expected to function effectively unless its members are provided with both sufficient time to carry out the team's responsibilities and in-service training to help them acquire knowledge and skills necessary for their work as a team.

Hypothesis 3 dealt with the measure of teacher self-actualization. Significant differences were found between leadership team members in high and low achieving schools (Table 17) and between leadership team members and non-

leadership team members (Tables 19-20).

This study has revealed results similar to those obtained in other target populations. Persons functioning in an environment which provides them the opportunity to develop and utilize all their unique capabilities or potentialities are believed to have a higher degree of self-actualization. In this study, the leadership team is the device through which it is felt individuals may seek self-actualization or self-fulfillment.

Self-actualizing persons tend to score high on two specific scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory, Time Competence (TC) scale and Inner Directed (I) scale.

The high TC scores suggest that individuals are effective in living in the present as indicated by their tying the past and future into meaningful relationship.<sup>69</sup>

In addition, such scores could suggest that leadership team members with high TC scores seem to provide students with a secure and stable situation in which learning occurs. The secure base may be related to demonstration of enthusiasm for teaching, classroom organization and management, preparation and use of materials and resources, and the teacher's adherence to established routines and procedures -- a circumstance that gives students a sense of security and wellbeing.

---

<sup>69</sup>Shostrom, POI Manual, p. 15.

High Inner Directed scores suggest that individuals are guided by internal motivations. Thus, high scores by leadership team members could suggest that as teachers they are capable of motivating students to learn.

The high scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory should not be attributed solely to leadership team participation. As previously stated, leadership team members are selected by the principal or by colleagues. Those who are selected usually have shown a sense of self-efficacy and self-actualization. Hence, participation on the team tends to enhance and cultivate persons who already are self-actualizing to some extent.

### Conclusions

The findings of this study warrant the following conclusions:

1. There is lack of unanimity by principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members on the role expectations (duties and tasks) of the leadership team.
2. Leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members tend to differ more widely than other groups in this study in their perceptions of the duties and tasks of the leadership team.
3. Principals, leadership team chairpersons, and non-leadership team members are in general agreement in their perceptions of the performance of duties and tasks of the leadership team.
4. Principals and teachers (leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members) are more in agreement on the duties and tasks of the leadership team than teachers (leadership team chairpersons and non-leadership team members) are among themselves.
5. There is insufficient evidence to substantiate that leadership team practices and functions had an impact on pupil achievement in this study.

6. Leadership team members in this study experienced a greater measure of self-realization.

### Implications

Certain implications that grew out of the findings are:

1. The leadership team model offers a potentially useful approach for fostering teacher self-actualization and pupil achievement.
2. Mutual agreement and understanding of duties and functions may maximize participation, as well as pupil achievement and teacher self-actualization.
3. The principal's perception of the duties and functions of the leadership team may be a meaningful factor in team performance and pupil achievement.

### Recommendations

The recommendations resulting from this study are:

1. That a study structured around the variables or factors of involvement and time compensation be conducted on the leadership team to ascertain possible suggestions for increasing the team's effectiveness in regard to maximizing pupil achievement.
2. That further studies be done on the role of the leadership team as perceived by principals in order to test the hypothesis that: "Authority vested in a given role is maximized by congruence of role expectations and role performance."
3. That sensitivity training and human relations workshops be held for principals, leadership team members, and non-leadership team members for the purpose of promoting mutual trust, confidence and cooperation.
4. That in-service programs be conducted for instructional personnel to become more knowledgeable about the basic concept of shared leadership and the benefits of team participation in school decision making.

## APPENDIX

Appendix A

Correspondence





# ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

FRED A. TOOMER SCHOOL

65 ROGERS STREET, N.E.

ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30317

OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL  
TELEPHONE 373-6229

Dear

I am a doctoral student at Atlanta University in Education Administration and Supervision, and I need your help! I would appreciate your assistance with the distribution and collection of questionnaires relating to my research study.

The problem involved in my study is to determine whether or not the perceptions of the leadership role as held and participated in by the leadership team members and the teachers in their respective school units serve to induce increased pupil achievement in reading and mathematics and a fuller measure of teacher self-actualization in selected schools in Area II.

Enclosed are questionnaires and a cover letter for you and teachers on your staff as follows:

1. Leadership Team Chairperson during the previous (1980-81) school term
2. Two (2) leadership team members of the previous (1980-81) school term
3. Two (2) teachers who did not serve on the leadership team during the 1980-81 term

Please distribute the enclosed materials to the appropriate persons on your staff, and encourage them to return them to you. Inasmuch as I am operating within a deadline, I would be ever so grateful if you would return the completed questionnaires to me in the school mail on or before

I thank you in advance for your cooperation. If you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact me at 373-6229 or 691-4369.

Sincerely,

Nellie W. Adams

F. A. Toomer School

November 19, 1981

Dear Colleague,

I need your help! I am a doctoral student at Atlanta University, currently enrolled in educational research. The researchable problem is to determine whether or not the perceptions of the leadership role as held and participated in by the leadership team members and the teachers in their respective school units serve to induce increased pupil achievement in reading and mathematics and a fuller measure of teacher self-actualization in selected schools in Area II.

Enclosed are a questionnaire and an inventory that will take a few minutes of your time to complete. The questionnaire entitled "Perceptions of Duties and Responsibilities of Leadership Team", is designed to identify perceptions (characteristics) roles of leadership teams in the instructional and decision-making processes in the teaching-learning situation. The "Personal Orientation Inventory" (POI) is designed to measure self-actualization characteristics or performances.

If you would take time to respond to both instruments immediately, and return both instruments and the answer sheet to your principal, I shall appreciate it. Anonymity is assured, and your responses will be treated confidentially.

What the findings of this research may contribute to the profession, the school system, and most importantly, to the improvement of the quality of education for our boys and girls, is the only recompense I can offer in exchange for your time and effort devoted to the completion of these questionnaires. I hope you will be interested in my findings.

Please make every effort to return the completed questionnaire, the POI response sheet and booklet to your principal in time for them to reach me by

I thank you in advance for your cooperation. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 373-6229 or 691-4369.

Sincerely,

Nellie W. Adams

Fred A. Toomer School

November, 1981

Dear Colleague,

I need your help! I am a doctoral student at Atlanta University, currently enrolled in educational research. The researchable problem is to determine whether or not the perceptions of the leadership role as held and participated in by the leadership team members and the teachers in their respective school units serve to induce increased pupil achievement in reading and mathematics and a fuller measure of teacher self-actualization in selected schools in Area II.

Enclosed is a questionnaire that will take only a few minutes to complete. This questionnaire is designed to identify perceptions (characteristics) roles of leadership teams in the instructional and decision-making processes in the teaching-learning situation.

If you would take time to respond to the questionnaire immediately, and return it to your principal, I shall appreciate it. Anonymity is assured, and your responses will be treated confidentially.

What the findings of this research may contribute to the profession, the school system, and most importantly, to the improvement of the quality of education for our boys and girls, is the only recompense I can offer in exchange for your time and effort devoted to the completion of this questionnaire. I hope you will be interested in my findings.

Please make every effort to return the completed questionnaire to your principal in time for it to reach me by

I thank you in advance for your cooperation. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 373-6229 or 691-4369.

Sincerely,

Nellie W. Adams

Appendix B

Instruments

## LEADERSHIP TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

### Perceptions of Duties and Responsibilities of Leadership Teams

**Directions:** In this questionnaire you are asked to respond to statements concerning duties and responsibilities of the leadership team during the previous school term 1980-81.

1. Indicate whether you agree, probably agree, probably disagree, or disagree with each specific item as an appropriate task or responsibility of the leadership team in its decision-making role. Mark your responses in the following manner:

If you agree with the item, circle A.    A PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably agree with the item, circle PA.                    A PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably disagree with the item, circle PD.                    A PA PD D

If you disagree with the item, circle D.    A PA PD D

2. Then rate each item. The rating scale is as follows: 5-Often; 4-Usually; 3-Occasionally; 2-Seldom; 1-Never. You are to check the rating that best reflects the extent to which the leadership team in your school directly or indirectly engaged in or performed each task. Please place a check ( ) mark in the appropriate column to indicate your rating, regardless of your agreement or disagreement with the item.

Check your Position:           Principal           Leadership Team  
   Chairperson           Non-Leadership Team Member

#### Items Description

#### Rating

##### A. Instructional Coordination

1. Develop and coordinate use of instructional materials budgets, both Board of Education and special budgets ----

	5	4	3	2	1
	Oft.	Usu.	Oc.	Sel.	Nvr.
A PA PD D					

			5	4	3	2	1
			Oft.	Usu.	Oc.	Sel.	Nvr.
2. Coordinate compensatory instruction, such as Title I reading and math, with regular instruction so that it is an extension of the regular program ----	A	PA	PD	D			
3. Determine appropriate learning materials for pupils ----	A	PA	PD	D			
4. Update inventory of instructional materials and post for teacher information ----	A	PA	PD	D			
5. Schedule instructional team meetings ----	A	PA	PD	D			
6. Help school to have functioning instructional team meetings ----	A	PA	PD	D			
7. Recommend the assignment of special teachers (Title I, special education) to appropriate instructional level team ----	A	PA	PD	D			
8. Work with media specialist to encourage all staff to review ECD units sent from Central Office----	A	PA	PD	D			
9. Help teachers identify and incorporate community resources into instruction ----	A	PA	PD	D			
10. Help develop instructional program applicable to local school environment ----	A	PA	PD	D			
11. Help teachers determine the instructional levels of pupils ----	A	PA	PD	D			
12. Check teachers' teaching plans for reading and math skills instruction ----	A	PA	PD	D			
13. Help teachers understand reading and math skills necessary at their specific levels of instruction ----	A	PA	PD	D			

- |   |           | 5    | 4    | 3   | 2    | 1    |
|---|-----------|------|------|-----|------|------|
|   |           | Oft. | Usu. | Oc. | Sel. | Nvr. |
| 14. Offer suggestions to teachers for effective management of instructional groups ----                   | A PA PD D |      |      |     |      |      |
| 15. Make recommendations on scheduling and time blocks for subject areas, especially reading and math---- | A PA PD D |      |      |     |      |      |
| 16. Monitor pacing in reading and math, and confer with teachers when problems exist ----                 | A PA PD D |      |      |     |      |      |

## B. Curriculum Development

1. Assist each staff member A PA PD D  
in the development of a  
teaching-learning unit----
2. Give leadership to curric- A PA PD D  
ulum development activities---
3. Set tone for program de- A PA PD D  
velopment and curricular  
revision ----
4. Participate in decisions A PA PD D  
relative to imple-  
mentation of individualized  
learning program ----
5. Plan and develop human A PA PD D  
relations experiences for  
teachers and pupils to  
strengthen the curriculum  
of affect ----
6. Decide on subject areas A PA PD D  
to be taught in accordance  
with the individualized plan----
7. Share with entire staff A PA PD D  
information concerning  
ECD progress on a regular  
basis ----
8. Share the services of A PA PD D  
teacher aides in the de-  
velopment of curriculum  
materials ----

- [illegible]

1. Develop leadership and organizational plan for formation of leadership team ---- A PA PD D

3. Orient all staff to in- A PA PD D  
structional program and the  
rationale and operation  
of the leadership team----

4. Assist staff in identity A PA PD D  
of inservice needs ----

5. Plan staff development activities based on staff needs ----

6. Secure and coordinate resources for inservice implementation ---- A PA PD D

7. Stay on call for help to A PA PD D individual teachers, i.e., demonstrate, classroom organization and management----

8. Maintain, in writing on A PA PD D  
designated form, records  
of meetings and leader-  
ship decisions ----

9. Decide and coordinate staff representation for ECD workshops and visitations ----

10. Implement a simulation A PA PD D  
of the individualized learning  
process with the school  
staff ----



		5	4	3	2	1
		Oft.	Usu.	Oc.	Sel.	Nvr.
11. Encourage staff to read professional literature and interact with colleagues ----	A PA PD D					
12. Review subject areas in which teachers are individualizing ----	A PA PD D					
13. Work with contact person in special areas to plan staff development experiences following workshops in specific content area ----	A PA PD D					
14. Encourage staff to respond to self Assessment Instrument and the Checklist for Assessing individualized Instruction distributed by the Central Office ----	A PA PD D					
15. Collect and compile results of checklist for Assessing Individualized Instruction for total school----	A PA PD D					
16. Encourage teachers to post ECD individualized model in each classroom for on-going discussion with pupils ----	A PA PD D					
17. Select and/or enlist resource help and support in making ECD staff presentation at workshops, PTA, etc. ----	A PA PD D					
18. Recognize and show appreciation to teachers for effective teaching ----	A PA PD D					
<b>D. <u>Evaluation</u></b>						
1. Identify and/or develop evaluative instruments and procedures regarding ECD ----	A PA PD D					

		5	4	3	2	1
		Oft.	Usu.	Oc.	Sel.	Nvr.
2. Participate in decisions A PA PD D relative to evaluation of individualized learning programs						
3. Plan for periodic A PA PD D parent-teahcer conferences----						
4. Review procedures for A PA PD D setting up and maintain- ing diagnostic folders ----						
5. Assist teachers in A PA PD D evaluating their own performance ----						
6. Assist in staff de- A PA PD D velopment in use of check- lists and report cards----						
7. Encourage teachers to A PA PD D make effective use of evaluative findings ----						
<u>E. General School Improvement</u>						
1. Organize an Advisory A PA PD D Council representative of a cross section of school and community personnel ----						
2. Utilize materials con- A PA PD D cerning parental involve- ment ----						
3. Keep parents and faculty A PA PD D aware of School Plan of Action through an ap- propriate display of bulletin board in the school ----						
4. Develop appropriate dis- A PA PD D plays of school's indi- vidualized program for Board of Education meetings in Area II ----						

- [illegible]

1. Decide individual and class assignment for pupils ---- A PA PD D
2. Make recommendations relative to deployment of staff within instructional levels ---- A PA PD D
3. Review roles of all personnel from Management by Objectives (MBO) charts ---- A PA PD D
4. Identify contact person to be responsible for each content area within the curriculum ---- A PA PD D
5. Assist in orienting all new teachers to ECD ---- A PA PD D
6. Encourage identification of pupils for special education service ---- A PA PD D

1. Help establish rules for A PA PD D pupils' behavior and participation in ECD Porgram ----

		5	4	3	3	1
		Of.	Usu.	Oc.	Sel.	Nvr.
2. Provide Opportunities for students to co-operate in activities for the good of the school or class ----	A PA PD D					
3. Help pupils become familiar with rules and regulations of the school ----	A PA PD D					
<u>H. General Administration</u>						
1. Develop Plan of Action for implementing system-wide objectives ----	A PA PD D					
2. Plan series of activities to keep parents informed of school activities (i.e., system-wide objectives) ----	A PA PD D					
3. Assist in the construction of a management plan for school ----	A PA PD D					
4. Keep an up-to-date management plan on display in the school ----	A PA PD D					
5. Review copies of school requisition orders and minutes of Leadership Team Meetings at intervals ----	A PA PD D					
6. Confer with monitoring team from Area and Central Offices on progress toward achieving school's goals ----	A PA PD D					
7. Serve as spokesmen for school regarding ECD matters ----	A PA PD D					
8. Encourage pupils to participate in planning and administering all school activities as much as possible---	A PA PD D					

		5	4	3	2	1
		Oft.	Usu.	Oc.	Se.	Nvr.
9. Review progress toward achieving school's goals with staff ----	A PA PD D					
I. <u>Policymaking</u>						
1. Recommend policies for adoption by school ----	A PA PD D					
2. Supervise the determination of intermediate level policy questions such as the selection of textbooks or the adoption of a common approach to a subject across classes----	A PA PD D					
3. Suggest policy for special on-going activity, such as a school-wide silent reading period ----	A PA PD D					
4. Establish policy for determining pupils' grades on report cards ----	A PA PD D					

Major Source:

Atlanta Public Schools, The Division of Instructional Planning and Development, Elementary Teacher Handbook, Revised --1979.

# POI<sup>®</sup>

## PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

EVERETT L. SHOSTROM, Ph.D.

### DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "a". (See Example Item 1 at right.) If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "b". (See Example Item 2 at right.) If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don't know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

Section of Answer Column Correctly Marked		
	a	b
1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

~~Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.~~

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND START WITH QUESTION 1.



PUBLISHED BY EdITS  
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92107

Copyright ©1962 by Everett L. Shostrom

Copyright ©1963 by Educational & Industrial Testing Service

1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.  
b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.
2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.  
b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.
3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.  
b. I do not always tell the truth.
4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.  
b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.
5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.  
b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.  
b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.
7. a. I am afraid to be myself.  
b. I am not afraid to be myself.
8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.  
b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.  
b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.  
b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.
11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.  
b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.
12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.  
b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.
13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.  
b. Anger is something I try to avoid.
14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.  
b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.
15. a. I put others' interests before my own.  
b. I do not put others' interests before my own.
16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.  
b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.
17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.  
b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.
18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.  
b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.  
b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.
20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.  
b. My moral values are self-determined.
21. a. I do what others expect of me.  
b. I feel free to not do what others expect of me.
22. a. I accept my weaknesses.  
b. I don't accept my weaknesses.
23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.  
b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.
24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.  
b. I am hardly ever cross.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.  
b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.
48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.  
b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
49. a. I like everyone I know.  
b. I do not like everyone I know.
50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.  
b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.
51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.  
b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people act right.
52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.  
b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.
53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.  
b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.
54. a. Impressing others is most important.  
b. Expressing myself is most important.
55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.  
b. I can feel right without always having to please others.
56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.  
b. I will not risk a friendship just to say or do what is right.
57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.  
b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.
58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.  
b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.
59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.  
b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.
60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.  
b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.
61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.  
b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.
62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.  
b. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.  
b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
64. a. Appearances are all-important.  
b. Appearances are not terribly important.
65. a. I hardly ever gossip.  
b. I gossip a little at times.
66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.  
b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.  
b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.  
b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE



25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.  
b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.
26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.  
b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.
27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.  
b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
28. a. My feelings of self-worth depend on how much I accomplish.  
b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.
29. a. I fear failure.  
b. I don't fear failure.
30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.  
b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.  
b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.  
b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.
33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.  
b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.  
b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.
35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.  
b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.
36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.  
b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.
37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.  
b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.
38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.  
b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.  
b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.
40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.  
b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.  
b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.  
b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.
43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.  
b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.
44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.  
b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.
45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.  
b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.
46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.  
b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.  
b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.
70. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.  
b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
71. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.  
b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.
72. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.  
b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.
73. a. Man is naturally cooperative.  
b. Man is naturally antagonistic.
74. a. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.  
b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.
75. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.  
b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.
76. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.  
b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.
77. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.  
b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.
78. a. Self-interest is natural.  
b. Self-interest is unnatural.
79. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.  
b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.
80. a. For me, work and play are the same.  
b. For me, work and play are opposites.
81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.  
b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.
82. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.  
b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
83. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.  
b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.
84. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.  
b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.
85. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.  
b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.
86. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.  
b. I can be silly when I feel like it.
87. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.  
b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.
88. a. I worry about the future.  
b. I do not worry about the future.
89. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.  
b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.
90. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.  
b. I prefer to use good things now.
91. a. People should always control their anger.  
b. People should express honestly-felt anger.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.  
b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.
93. a. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.  
b. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
94. a. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel bubbling up within me.  
b. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.
95. a. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.  
b. I have never had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
96. a. I am orthodoxly religious.  
b. I am not orthodoxly religious.
97. a. I am completely free of guilt.  
b. I am not free of guilt.
98. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.  
b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.
99. a. I enjoy detachment and privacy.  
b. I do not enjoy detachment and privacy.
100. a. I feel dedicated to my work.  
b. I do not feel dedicated to my work.
101. a. I can express affection regardless of whether it is returned.  
b. I cannot express affection unless I am sure it will be returned.
102. a. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.  
b. Only living for the moment is important.
103. a. It is better to be yourself.  
b. It is better to be popular.
104. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.  
b. Wishing and imagining are always good.
105. a. I spend more time preparing to live.  
b. I spend more time actually living.
106. a. I am loved because I give love.  
b. I am loved because I am lovable.
107. a. When I really love myself, everybody will love me.  
b. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.
108. a. I can let other people control me.  
b. I can let other people control me if I am sure they will not continue to control me.
109. a. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.  
b. As they are, people do not annoy me.
110. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary meaning.  
b. Only when living for the future ties into living for the present does my life have meaning.
111. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."  
b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."
112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.  
b. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.
113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.  
b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.
114. a. I have had an experience where life seemed just perfect.  
b. I have never had an experience where life seemed just perfect.
115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.  
b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which fights good.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.  
b. A person can never change his essential nature.
117. a. I am afraid to be tender.  
b. I am not afraid to be tender.
118. a. I am assertive and affirming.  
b. I am not assertive and affirming.
119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.  
b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.
120. a. I see myself as others see me.  
b. I do not see myself as others see me.
121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.  
b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.
122. a. Men should be assertive and affirming.  
b. Men should not be assertive and affirming.
123. a. I am able to risk being myself.  
b. I am not able to risk being myself.
124. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.  
b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
125. a. I suffer from memories.  
b. I do not suffer from memories.
126. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.  
b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.
127. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.  
b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.
128. a. I am self-sufficient.  
b. I am not self-sufficient.
129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.  
b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
130. a. I always play fair.  
b. Sometimes I cheat a little.
131. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.  
b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.
132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.  
b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.
133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.  
b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.
134. a. I can accept my mistakes.  
b. I cannot accept my mistakes.
135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.  
b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.
136. a. I regret my past.  
b. I do not regret my past.
137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.  
b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.
138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.  
b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.

139. a. People have an instinct for evil.  
b. People do not have an instinct for evil.
140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.  
b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.
141. a. People are both good and evil.  
b. People are not both good and evil.
142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.  
b. My past is a handicap to my future.
143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.  
b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.
144. a. For me, past, present and future is in meaningful continuity.  
b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.
145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.  
b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.
146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.  
b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.
147. a. People are basically good.  
b. People are not basically good.
148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.  
b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.
149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.  
b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.
150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.  
b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- Bentzen, Mary M. and Association. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.
- Campbell, Roald F., Bridges, Edwin M., Nystrand, Raphael O. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.
- Frick, Williard B. Humanistic Psychology: Interviews with Maslow, Murphy, and Rogers. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.
- Getzels, Jacob. "Administration as a Social Process." In Administrative Theory in Education. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: The Midwestern Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Good, Carter V. and Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Gorton, Richard A. School Administration and Supervision. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. School Administration and Supervision, Challenge and Opportunity for Leadership. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1976.
- Hanson, R.A. and Schutz, R.E. "A New Look at Schooling Effects from Programmatic Research and Development." In Making Change Happen. Edited by D. Mann. New York: Teacher College Press, 1978.
- Hemphill, John K., Griffiths, Daniel E., Frederiksen, Norman. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia

University, 1962.

- Herzberg, Frederick. "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" in Classics of Organizational Behavior. Edited by Walter E. Natemeyer. Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company, Inc., 1978.
- Hoover, Kenneth H. and Hollingsworth, Paul M. Learning and Teaching in the Elementary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.
- Howard, Eugene R. and Brainard, Edward A. How School Administrators Make Things Happen. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.
- Jenson, Theodore J., et al. Elementary School Administration (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.
- Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Maslow, A.H. "A Theory of Human Motivation." In Classics of Organizational Behavior. Edited by Walter E. Natemeyer. Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company, Inc., 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- McGregor, Douglas Murray. "The Human Side of Enterprise." In Classics of Organizational Behavior. Edited by Walter E. Natemeyer. Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company, Inc., 1978.
- National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals. The Elementary School Principalship. 38th Yearbook, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958.
- Neagley, Ross L.; Evans, N. Dean; Lynn, Clarence C., Jr. The School Administrator and Learning Resources. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Rubin, Louis. Curriculum Handbook. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Elliott, David L. Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1975.

- Goldman, Jeffrey A. "Effect of a Faculty Workshop Upon Self-Actualization," Education 78. (March/April 1978): 254-255.
- Higgins, Norman C. "Formative Evaluation of Teacher Managed Instructional Programs," Educational Technology XX, 12 (December 1980): 22-25.
- Keeler, B.J. and Andrews, J.H.M. "The Leader Behavior of Principals, Staff Morale and Productivity," Alberta Journal of Educational Research 9 (September 1963): 179-191.
- Mann, Dale. "Ten Years of Decentralization: A Review of the Involvement of Urban Communities in School Decision Making," IRCD Bulletin, 10, 3 (New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Columbia University (Summer 1975): 15-21.
- McDermott, Betty. "We Are All In This Together," Thrust 10, 1 (October 1980): 30-31.
- Newton, James E. "Whose Responsibility is the Curriculum?" The Clearing House 50, 2 (October 1976): 66-67.
- Pellicer, Leonard O. and Nemeth, Gyura. "Tired of Carrying the World on Your Shoulders? Try Team Management," NASSP Bulletin 64, 439 (November 1980): 97-102.
- Redfern, George B. "Principal Power: Learning to Live with Less," The National Elementary Principal 58, 3 (March 1979): 55-61.
- Snyder, Milton L. "Management Team: What's It All About," Thrust 8, 2 (November 1978): 4-8.
- Swick, Kevin. "Communications Techniques for Effecting Productive Team Planning," The Clearing House 50, 3 (November 1976): 117-119.
- Vaughn, Jacquelyn B. "The Expanding Role of Teachers in Negotiating Curriculum," Educational Leadership 34, 1 (October 1976): 21-23.
- Weingast, David. "Shared Leadership - 'The Damm Thing Works'", Educational Leadership 37 (March 1980): 502-503.

#### Reports

- Coleman, James S. "Equality of Educational Opportunity," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.



The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association. Leadership at Work. Fifteenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C., 1943.

### Articles and Periodicals

Anthony, Margaret. "An Inside View of Shared Leadership," Educational Leadership 38, 6 (March 1981): 487-488.

Appel, Joseph J. "Public Education: Time for Commitment," Thrust 10, 1 (October 1980): 31-32.

Averch, H.A., et al. "How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review of Research," Educational Technology 14, 4 (April 1974) 42-46.

Bailey, William J. and Neale, Daniel C. "Teachers and School Improvement," The Educational Forum XLV, 1 (November 1980): 69-76.

Belasco, James A. and Alutto, Joseph A. "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly 8, 1 (Winter 1972): 44-58.

Blumberg, Arthur; Wayson, William; and Weber, Wilford. "The Elementary School Cabinet: Report of an Experience in Participative Decision-Making," Educational Administration Quarterly 5, 3 (Autumn 1969): 32-52.

Bridges, Edward M. "A Model for Shared Decision-Making in the Principalship," Educational Administration Quarterly 3 (Winter 1967): 49-61.

Brown, Daniel L. "Total Client Involvement in School Design," Phi Delta Kappan. 56, 5 (January 1975): 349-351.

Duke, Daniel L., Showers, Beverly K., and Imber, Michael. "Teachers and Shared Decision Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement," Educational Administration Quarterly XVI, 1 (Winter 1980): 93-105.

Farmer, Rod. "Humanism, Self-Actualization and Social Studies," The Social Studies, 72, 5 (September/October 1981): 208-211.

Floratos, Nick et al. "The Management Team and Survival," Thrust 8 (November 1978): 5-6.

Garte, Sumner H. and Rosenblum, Mark L. "Lighting Fires in Burned-Out Counselors," The Personnel Guidance Journal 57, 3 (November 1978): 158-160.

Cooke, Robert A. and Coughlan, Robert J. "Survey Feedback and Problem Solving with Complementary Collection Decision Structures." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, February, 1973.

Office of Education Performance Review. "School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools." Albany, New York: State of New York Office of Education, March, 1974.

Self Realization Through Education. Proceedings of the VIIth World Congress of the International Association for the Advancement of Educational Research, 7th, (Gent, Belgium) July 25-29, 1977.

Schmuck, Richard A. "Development of Management Teamwork: National Overview," Paper presented at Educational Managers Annual Academy. 5th, (Wemme, Oregon) July 22, 1974.

Shostrom, Everett L. Manual for the Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego, California: Ed 175 (Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1974).

#### Unpublished Material

Atlanta Public Schools, Elementary Curriculum Development, "Management by Objectives Procedures Plan," 1977. (mimeographed).

Moyer, Donald C. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Leadership as They Relate to Teacher Satisfaction," Ph.D. diss., Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1954.

## VITA

ADAMS, NELLIE RUTH WRIGHT

### Education:

A.B., Morris Brown College, 1950; M.A., Atlanta University, 1959; Atlanta University Professional Diploma, Specialist in Administration, 1969; Plan to complete requirements for Doctor of Education Degree. July, 1982.

### Experience:

Elementary School Teacher, Atlanta Public School System, 1950-1965; Curriculum Assistant, Atlanta Public Schools, 1965-68; Principal, F.L. Stanton Elementary School, 1968-1977; Principal, F.A. Toomer Elementary School, 1977 to present.

### Personal Information

Married; one son; member of Local, State, and National Education Association; member of: (1) Phi Delta Kappa, (2) Alpha Kappa Alpha Alpha Sorority, Inc., (3) Links, Inc.